

**LANGUAGE PREPARATION
AND THE
COMMUNICATION OF THE GOSPEL**

Third Annual Conference of Mission Board Secretaries
to consider the improvement of language preparation of
personnel engaged in the world mission of the Church.

APRIL 26-28, 1956

THE KENNEDY SCHOOL OF MISSIONS

THE HARTFORD SEMINARY FOUNDATION BULLETIN

Number 23

June 1957

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TITLE PAGE	i
TABLE OF CONTENTS	ii
FORWARD	iii
CONFERENCE PROGRAM	iv
KEYNOTE ADDRESS by William A. Smalley	1
PLENARY SESSIONS	
I — Training Programs Abroad	25
II — Training Programs Before Sailing	47
III — Linguistics and Techniques of Language Learning ...	58
IV — Language Aptitude and Testing Programs	72
V — Total Language Program for a Mission	76
SUMMARY by Eugene A. Nida	86
LIST OF RECOMMENDED BOOKS	97
CONFERENCE PARTICIPANTS	100

FOREWORD

J. MAURICE HOHLFELD—*Conference Chairman*

There is no doubt that communication plays a signal role in the world mission enterprise. The very word itself is related to communion, to fellowship and to sharing. These connotations are basic aspects of the faith we wish to propagate. Not only is communication the concern of the missionary abroad, but it is also of vital interest to the missionary candidate, to the mission board executive, and to the instructor and the professor of missions.

For these reasons, the Third Annual Conference for Mission Board Secretaries met at the Kennedy School of Missions of the Hartford Seminary Foundation to consider *Language Preparation and the Communication of the Gospel*. Similar gatherings were held at the same place in 1954 to investigate *The Church's Preparation in Today's World*. The main theme of those meetings was the improvement of preparation of personnel for the overseas service of the Church. The 1955 sessions centered about *The Missionary and the Cultures of Man*. A major question was the basis of the discussions; namely, "How shall we prepare the missionary to relate himself constructively to the social complexities he must encounter abroad?"

The following report contains gleanings from the recorded messages and discussions of the group. Much of the labor of transcribing and editing was done by Miss Norma Bloomquist, who served as Conference Secretary.

It is hoped that the proceedings of the meetings will be of value not only to those who participated, but also to all the readers who are interested in our common problem.

CONFERENCE PROGRAM

Thursday, April 26

5:00 p.m.—Registration (Gillett Hall—12)

7:30— Opening Session (Gillett Hall—19)

Welcome—President Russell Henry Stafford

Key-Note Address—William A. Smalley

Friday, April 27

9:00—

First Session:

“TRAINING PROGRAMS ABROAD”

Chairman—J. MAURICE HOHLFELD

MEMBERS OF PANEL

C. LOEHLIN (India)

MISS E. KEYES (Congo)

P. ORJALA (Haiti)

MISS M. BLACK (Liberia)

H. MCKAUGHAN (Philippines)

MISS S. ROBINSON (Algeria)

11:00—

Second Session:

“TRAINING PROGRAMS BEFORE SAILING”

Chairman—H. ALLEN GLEASON, JR.

TYPES OF PROGRAMS

1. HENRY C. FENN (Yale University)

2. CARLETON HODGE (Foreign Service Institute)

3. BENJAMIN ELSON (Summer Inst. of Linguistics)

4. WILLIAM E. WELMERS (Kennedy School of Missions)

2:30—

Third Session:

“LINGUISTICS AND TECHNIQUES OF LANGUAGE LEARNING”

Chairman—WILLIAM E. WELMERS

Panel: GLEASON, MCKAUGHAN, STEVICK AND SMALLEY

7:30—

Fourth Session:

“LANGUAGE APTITUDE AND TESTING PROGRAMS”

Chairman—HENRY C. FENN

Discussant—MAURICE TATSUOKA

Demonstration with tape recorded samples

Saturday, April 28

9:00—

Fifth Session:

“TOTAL LANGUAGE PROGRAM FOR A MISSION”

Chairman—RICHARD DERIDDER

Panel: NIDA, WELMERS, STEVICK

10:30— *Summarization:* EUGENE A. NIDA

12:15— Adjournment

**LANGUAGE PREPARATION
AND THE
COMMUNICATION OF THE GOSPEL**

APRIL 26-28, 1956

A report of the Third Annual Conference of Mission Board Secretaries to consider the improvement of language preparation of missionary personnel engaged in the world mission of the Church. The meetings were held at The Kennedy School of Missions of the Hartford Seminary Foundation, 55 Elizabeth Street, Hartford 5, Connecticut.

KEYNOTE ADDRESS

WILLIAM A. SMALLEY

Associate Secretary, American Bible Society

Dr. Nida tells about being in Japan and talking to a young Japanese lady. She had just come from a church service in which a Japanese scholar had spoken. She was raving over the wonderful address he had given. "What did the scholar talk about?" Dr. Nida asked. She said she didn't know, but "it was wonderful, it was so fluent and beautiful."

There are cultures, there are situations in which to be eloquent or even to be obscure is highly desirable. But most missionaries want to be understood. They want to be fluent. They want to speak in a natural, easy, forceful way. They want to get a message across in a language which in most cases is not a native language to them.

At times there are some who revert to the use of interpreters but I think we all recognize the pitfalls and difficulties. For example, a visiting dignitary was speaking to a congregation in Haiti and said he was "tickled to death to be present". The interpreter turned and asked him again what he said. The missionary repeated that he was "tickled to death to be here." The poor interpreter said, "Brethren, I don't know what the pastor means but he said he scratched himself until he died."

Most of our missionaries want to avoid the pitfalls of using an interpreter. They want to communicate directly with people in their own language. They come to it perhaps with some language background or some experience in language learning. They studied

Latin in high school, French in college and Greek in seminary. Now they have set out to "take" Korean or Bulu or Hindi or Arabic or some other language in the same grim and determined way. They enroll in the best school, hire the best scholar, buy the best books and the best dictionaries. Then they seclude themselves in the quietest room in the house to study.

Sometimes the results are good. We all know of cases where they have become masters of that language medium. We know of other cases where their knowledge is limited but useful. And we all know of cases where they never really succeeded. In any case, they were subjected to frustrations, to waste of months of time, to difficulties which they shouldn't have had to face. It could have been better for them. In case of the poorer ones, that difference might have been a difference between poor communication and at least adequate communication.

Today there is a greater and greater tendency to cultural isolation on the part of missionaries. This is something which missionary pioneers couldn't do because they did not have any opportunities to indulge in cultural isolation. There are big lawns, the compound walls, the servants who know English, the Christian leaders who know English well, the Christian community which is used to its missionaries and missionary colleagues, the cars that we use instead of public conveyances, which make so much better transportation but so much worse language situations. Item after item which helps to build this wall of cultural isolation, this foreignness, this distance could be enumerated. So many of the cities of the other nations are becoming westernized. As we are western in them, we continue with our western habits rather than gain habits of language and culture which we need in this new situation. Our missionary system is convenient and comfortable at times, but linguistically it tends to build up a sense of distance and paternalism which is deadly to communication. Linguistics with its revolutionary viewpoints has something very important to offer these days in the field of language preparation. There have been extremely important experiments in language teaching. There have been the contributions of anthropology and culture studies. We have more resources than we have had before. We have more that we can talk about, more that we can apply to our missionary communication situation. It makes it very important for us to re-study our problem continually.

The different groups present here have different types of practical difficulties to face. The mission executive has practical problems of the administrator and executive. He has a tradition which he has to face whether he likes it or not. It may be an important tradition in many ways. He has to consider the personality of the missionaries. He has the practical problems of the individual missionary who may for one reason or other not want to learn a language, or may be engaged in so many other duties that he doesn't have time to learn a language. The administrator has to deal with field committees, language committees who have done things in a certain way for many years and don't want to change. They see no reason for changing even though he himself may see that the set-up is inadequate. Then he has to deal with budgets, and changes seem to cost money. Some of us who look at things from a non-administrative viewpoint might think that it's less expensive in the long run to make the changes, but the initial costs are always high.

We need a great deal that the psychologist can offer us in our problems. What he can tell us about learning theory and aptitudes, how can he measure the ability of our missionary candidates to learn a new language? Can he even go so far as to test things like motivation and the extent to which missionaries will identify themselves with a new people? These are very basic to the degree in which they are going to communicate efficiently.

The linguist or the linguistically-oriented language teacher has much to say. In setting up his language courses, his language training program, how can he provide for the tremendous differences in personality between the students; between the individual who will just die if he can't get into a place where he can talk and will immerse himself in the local culture simply because he is extroverted and insists on talking to people and listening to them talk to him; and the other individual, the other extreme, who likes to stay in a study and doesn't want to talk and mix with people? How can he provide for such differences, how can he provide for differences in ability, so that all will go on with the best possible training?

How can he cope with the fact that in some languages there are large numbers of people who are going to use the language? The number of missionaries going to Japan since the war is phenomenal. Contrast that with the handful who may go to a small African

language area. Yet that small handful needs to learn its language just as well as the missionaries to Japan. He deals with abstract materials in a great deal of his work. He has to make those abstract materials practical, or they are not going to do any good.

All of these problems we will have to face together. In a conference like this, they can't be solved by any one group. They can't be solved by legislation. We can't say that a person who doesn't get the language in a certain length of time will be sent home. That isn't the solution to our problem. Our problem is how are we going to equip our missionaries? How are we going to see to it that they learn the language?

Let me relate some little biographies of some people whom I have known. Missionary A. is a born talker. He learned French in college. He studied it in France; he was there for several months. He can't help talking and joining in conversation wherever he is. Later he went out to the mission field and studied Vietnamese. He mingled with people and learned it in the same way—learned it so fluently that he hemmed-and -hawed the way the Vietnamese people do. That is a sure sign that an individual has immersed himself in language situation. Then he started to undertake missionary work among the tribal people. If he had gone about his language study in that tribal group the way he had learned French and Vietnamese, if with his natural ability to mimic, his drive to communicate with people, if he had put himself out into a village and lived there, I don't think it would have taken him long to learn that tribal language there. But he didn't. He stayed in his Vietnamese community and allowed himself to use interpreters. He tried to reduce the language to writing. One thing or another came up and he never learned it. He had the ability but he never put himself in a situation where he could use that language.

Missionary B. was a scholar. He was very much aware of and alive to the subtleties of the language which he had learned. He learned those things well, but he had started to study the language in a particular way. He was convinced that his success was due to the way in which he started. He had a list of all of the possible combinations of the vowels, consonants and tones in the language, listed without reference to meaning, without reference to usage, without reference to context. Three months were spent with

his teacher, simply reciting those combinations, those syllables, as though each were a single phrase. Over and over again he went down the list endlessly. Now that is practice of a kind and he is convinced that his mastery of the language is due to his start in that fashion. But it wasn't. He doesn't talk the way he pronounced those syllables, one after the other. He slurs his words together just like any speaker of the language does. His sounds rise and fall and are spoken with the lilt and intonation of a fresh and original speaker, not in the style of the cut-and-dried form in which he thinks he learned them. What he did was to live among the Vietnamese people. While he was following this course six hours a day of reciting those syllables one after the other, he was listening and he was talking and it was there that he learned to speak the language.

Missionary C. learned a tribal language. It was a language which had no literary tradition in which there were no books except those prepared by the Mission and there weren't many of them. It was the opinion of all of the missionaries working in that language that it was a very poor language with a very small vocabulary, perhaps just a few hundred words. Missionary C can communicate after a fashion and people are very kind to him. People make it easy for him when they talk to him. In most cases he talks to them and doesn't listen very much. If he were to go out into a village at night and instead of talking all the time, listen to what people were saying around him he'd soon become aware of the fact that truly he had missed quite a bit. Books do have one advantage. They help the learner to realize how much more there is to be learned. When there are only books that have been prepared by the mission, that advantage is lost. He had not learned to tap the experience of native speakers, not learned to tap the language from its real source. His school training had given him the idea that you got language out of books. It wasn't enough.

Missionary D. went to a very good language school. It was a field language school that had a high reputation, high standards and high requirements. He took the course and passed it well. When he was finished, he was able to talk, read and write well. Yet one day as he was downtown he heard a fellow American talking the language and he was surprised at his fluency. He

struck up a conversation with him. He asked him how long he had been in the country, and found that it had been only a few weeks. "Where did you learn the language?" he asked. "When I was at Yale. I spent nine months there a couple of years ago." He was struck with the fact that this person who had just come to the country, spoke in some ways with a fluency and ease that he himself did not have. You may think that that contradicts what I was saying a little earlier about people who didn't put themselves in a language environment. *Sometimes it's possible to create a better foreign language environment in the classroom in the U.S.A. than in some mission compounds around the world.*

Missionary E. is myself. I went to Paris and studied French for a few months. I had had enough linguistic training to be disturbed by that language program. I wrote voluminous reports and letters back home, urging a change. However, I plowed on through months of frustration and the feeling that I wasn't doing anywhere nearly what I should be doing. It was a great relief when the whole thing was over. There was a month or two after our examinations, before we sailed, when I could put myself into what I felt was a more satisfactory learning situation. I went to the field and found much of that same picture everywhere I went. It was in this way that a sort of sense of mission in this problem of missionary language training was born in me. I had sympathy and cooperation on the part of my colleagues, but somehow I couldn't seem to get across to them fully what I wanted to say. Somehow the linguist was not able to communicate with his colleagues on this problem. I found that we came from different worlds, with different assumptions and different viewpoints.

For example, Mr. Linquist and Mr. Missionary are having a little chat. Mr. Missionary asks Mr. L. for some suggestions about their language work. He wants to know what Mr. L. has to suggest for improvement in their committee-made language situation. So Mr. L. who has had a chance to look around suggests that it would be a good idea if they take advantage of some modern public courses that happen to be available in the language concerned, that the missionaries learn how to drill, how to mimic, that they learn how to get information from their teachers in

better fashion. That puzzled, funny look goes over Mr. M.'s face and he says, "Well, I think you ought to know that we hire the very best possible teachers for our students out here. Furthermore, one of my colleagues who speaks the language very well has studied the course which you mention and he doesn't think it's very good. For one thing, it doesn't even have the language written except in phonetic characters."

Out of the discussion Mr. M. has the general reaction that Mr. L. thinks it's easier to learn how to write by not writing, that you best learn grammar by making grammar very minor, that you should learn words without vocabulary, and that you study most effectively in a noisy village. It's true. But it is only true if you come at it with Mr. L.'s assumptions, not with the assumptions with which Mr. M. comes at it. That's where the communication problem comes in. So perhaps for a few minutes we ought to look at a few of the assumptions, with which Mr. L. approaches his work.

In language learning the mouth and ears are basic and essential. The hands and eyes are secondary. To put it another way, Mr. L. feels that writing is a clumsy representation of speech. Speech and writing must be very, very carefully distinguished in any language preparation program. You don't get at speech by following a writing system. If you look at it historically, speech in a sense is basic to writing. People have speech before they have writing. We know of many groups who have been given writing, languages which have been written, only in this present generation. This confusion of speech and writing goes right through the very fabric of our thinking. You see it in this type of statement, where Mr. M. has been talking to a group of people. He turns to a friend, a visitor from the outside and says, "These people don't have a language yet." Obviously, he doesn't mean that. He has just been using their language. He means that they don't have a writing system yet. In a sense, it's a careless way of speaking.

Our grammar books almost inevitably start with the alphabet. Your teacher starts out by teaching you the pronunciation of the letters. I spent a few months studying Vietnamese. The first day I worked very busily collecting what I thought would be

very useful phrases, greetings, "How do you do?" and so on. Vietnamese is very complicated in the way it says "How do you do?" Also, I learned how to count, and the things that I might be able to use right away. My teacher bore with me with great politeness. At the end of the session as he was getting ready to leave, hopefully and with Oriental courtesy he said, "Tomorrow perhaps, we can begin. I'll teach you the alphabet." It's basic to those of us who are brought up in the ways of the school, that we confuse speech and writing. We put them together. Until we get them untangled we can't have a sound language program. So many students feel that they have no clue to the language until they can read. They struggle on with these esoteric symbols while five year old Johnny and eight year old Joannie interpret for them to the servants.

Have you ever watched how children learn? Johnny and Joannie are on this side of the fence. There are some Thai youngsters on the other side of the fence. Each group is playing, pretending to pay no attention to the other. The next time you look out, they are all on one side of the fence or the other. They are playing together and they are talking to each other. One group is talking English and the other group is talking Thai. That makes no difference. They keep saying the same things over and over again, and they gesture. They don't talk baby-talk. They don't simplify it below their own childish standard, whatever their age level is. They talk. In a little while, and at the appropriate place in the game, Johnny and Joannie are using the Thai words.

Now you ask Johnny and Joannie what they are saying. They don't know. "It's just what you say when you do that thing in the game." Later on, the more they learn, they hear that word in other places, used by other people, and they begin to get an idea of the meaning of the words. Then they can tell you what it means in terms of their experience. It is a matter of saying the right thing at the right time. After watching them for a while, you go back to your books and toil away at your vocabulary lists.

There was an American who was traveling to Europe for the first time on a luxury-liner. He went to the table. He was the first one to sit down. So he started with his soup. In came a Frenchman, nodded politely, and said, "Bon appétit," which

is the French greeting at mealtime ("Have a good meal" or "Enjoy your meal.") Mr. Goldberg, the American, didn't know just what it was all about, so he stood up and bowed and said "Goldberg." Then they both sat down. At the next meal, in came the Frenchman, again late, and said, "Bon appétit." Mr. Goldberg looked really surprised this time. One introduction was enough. But he stood up once again and said "Goldberg," and then sat down. After this happened several times, he went up to someone and said, "Why does that Frenchman introduce himself each meal?" After he had been set straight, he decided he would show off his newly-acquired knowledge. He waited fifteen minutes so that he would be late for the meal the next time. Then the Frenchman would be sure to be there ahead of him. In he came and in his best French he said, "Bon appétit." The Frenchman stood up, bowed, and said, "Goldberg."

That's the way the children find out what words mean. In any situation like that there are pitfalls and difficulties. The well-constructed language course takes that factor of words in their setting, builds it into the course and helps you avoid the pitfalls while taking you efficiently on into what the meanings really are. You get ecstatic over your youngsters' pronunciation, the way they are picking up this language and you say, "Isn't it wonderful to be a child? Wish I could do it the way they can." Then you go back to your books. When they get too close to the window, you ask them to get farther away, because they are chattering so loud in Thai they are bothering you.

The linguist feels that the learner should be thrown into a real language situation. If possible it should be a controlled one, one in which the course is so prepared that the materials come to him in an efficient and orderly way, but still a natural way, and which begins with speech, the motor habits which go to make up talking and listening. Listening and talking: those he feels are the most basic. Reading and writing, of course, are tremendously important in any literate society, but he feels that the missionary will learn to read and write far better if he understands the way in which that writing system is based on speech. If he starts with the speech and doesn't confuse the two, the

new language learner will get more listening and speech drill in a couple of hours in a well-constructed course than he may get in several weeks' time in some other language courses.

The second assumption is that *language is more arbitrary than it is logical*. This, too, goes against our school tradition, where we are brought up to feel that Latin and Greek and French and English are the models of logic. You don't use a double negative because the one negative logically contradicts the other or eliminates it. Of course, the teacher who teaches that in French must do it with a guilty conscience. Most negatives in literary French are double negatives, but still, it's logical! It's taught as being logical. What could be more logical than gender? Masculine, feminine, neuter—what else could you have? But there, too, French presents a little difficulty. It has no neuter. Everything is either masculine or feminine. Most of the languages of the world pay no attention to these things at all.

In Southeast Asia, the languages use from 50 to 200 different categories that are roughly comparable to gender. They don't make sex the differentiating factor. Shape, size and general texture are some of the ways by which things are divided. This is not done logically. They are arbitrary. You can give some general clustering of things that go into one category or another, but there are always many things that are left over. There is no logical reason at all. It is simply the arbitrary way in which the language works. Why should *horse* in English, *cheval* in French represent the same four-legged object? There is no logical reason why these groups of sounds which are very different should represent the same thing. It is simply a matter of sound and association in the respective languages.

If Mother says *drink* often enough when she gives Junior his milk or water, soon Junior begins to get the association in that particular sequence of sounds, in that particular part of his life. Mr. Goldberg and Mr. Frenchman learn a little bit of vocabulary falsely but if they were put into more situations in which those same bits of language occurred, they'd soon find out the distinctions and would get the associations.

Even onomatopoeia is an arbitrary matter. We think that all roosters say *cockle-doodle-doo*. Those of you who have had

service abroad know that there is a variety of things that they do in other languages. In some languages *black* and *white* are verbs and for that matter in English, we say the *wave* in *wave goodbye* is a verb and the *wave* in *a wave of a hand* is a noun. Yet we say that verbs are actions and that nouns are the names of objects and things. Is there any difference between the two waves? These things aren't logical questions. The question is an arbitrary, grammatical usage. The linguist doesn't ask *why*, at least on this level. He asks *what* and *when* and *how* and *where*? What do you say in such-and-such a situation? When do you say this? How would you say this if you were doing so-and-so? Where would you use this type of expression? A good language course answers those questions automatically by presenting the material in the terms of the situations in which they arise. The examinations test the mastery of just those answers, not the *why* answers. The examination will ask what you will say. What would you respond to an elderly gentleman in the street when he greeted you with so-and-so? It doesn't say, "How would you translate *how do you do*?"

The missionary talks glibly of parts of speech in his language. You ask him just what is the difference between the parts of speech. He will look at you with one of those strange looks again and say, "Don't you know that *white* is an adjective?" Then you ask him how he *knows* what these parts of speech are. He'll say, "Actually, they are all mixed up together." Then you ask him, "What makes you think they are all mixed up together?" He may lay the reason for it to anything from diet deficiency to the fact that these people didn't get enough education to know the difference between a noun and a verb. The fact still remains that these reflect difficulties on his part, not in the language.

It has actually happened that a missionary has been terribly distressed over the fact that his language lacked a noun for *love*. You ask him "Can't you say that God loves us or that we love God or that people love children?" "Of course you can, but there isn't any noun for *love*. How can you talk about the *love of God* if you don't have a noun for it?" He hasn't learned to make those adjustments in terms of the arbitrary situation, the arbitrary associations which comprise the language. He thinks it must be logical, and logical in the sense of his experience only.

Then the third assumption with which the linguist approaches his language work is that the *language is a mechanism, not a junk-heap!* The typical language course, however, is the junk-heap approach. You have a junk-heap that you call the vocabulary, a heap of words with no relation between them. Maybe they are alphabetical, maybe they all have to do with parts of the body, but nothing that comes out of the language itself. A junk-heap of flash-cards. A junk-heap of illustrative sentences. The first one being about the elephant carrying a log, the second one being about the car going *honk-honk*, and so on down the list. The missionary laboriously learns to assemble a car out of this junk-heap, and to take one apart, but it doesn't run. In fact, if he is going to make it run, he has to change quite a few of the pieces, and wear some of them down so that they will fit together. If he makes it run, sometimes it is in addition to his language course and in spite of it. It's because of contact and experience on the outside, not entirely because of what he has learned. He has to unlearn a great deal. Our scholar missionary had a junk-heap of syllables and he spent three months on them. He didn't use them when he was talking, and he talked well.

I had an interesting experience where I studied French. In my second-year French I had a teacher who was quite unorthodox, and I was indignant. I had taken Latin and first-year French and I had been brought up on the junk-heap approach. I thought anything else was absolutely stupid. This teacher actually made us memorize whole paragraphs of French. Now looking back at it, it was an inefficient way of doing it; but still, he had a point. Then I went on to college and took a little more French. I found that I could use it better than my classmates, simply because of the fact that I was used to having put these words together in a more or less automatic way. But in college we went back to the more comfortable junk-heap approach. It was less work. I soon lost what little facility I had gained in that second year high school course.

Parsing doesn't teach anybody to talk. It doesn't mean that the linguist is against parsing. Linguists spend endless hours trying to figure out more subtle ways of dissecting languages, but they are convinced that you don't learn to talk languages in this way. They do that for other reasons, good reasons, but they don't

teach people to talk. Professor Gleason of this institution has estimated that to get a good mastery of the language you have to have about 80% control of the phonology, that is the sound system, 50 to 100% control of the grammar, and that in many situations you can get along with as little as even 1% of the vocabulary. You learn to drive the car by driving. You learn to speak the language by learning those habits of putting speech together, whether they are sound habits or grammatical habits. Putting them together in a way that is completely automatic isn't easy. Even if you can't use very many words, if you can put those words together easily, fluently, you can talk. More words will come far more easily afterwards.

The last assumption is that *language is part of the fabric of life*. The youngsters shouting as they twirl their tops; the old men muttering as they shuffle down the street; the two women screaming at each other in the marketplace because the one thinks that the other has cheated her; the taxi driver gesticulating wildly as he talks to his fare and is in danger, the fare thinks, of piling into a pedestrian; the Christian witnessing to his neighbor telling him something of the good news of Jesus Christ. To them language is simply a part of everyday life, but to the Westerner studying it, it's six hours of drudgery. It's meaning and grammar and dry study. It's trying to learn to translate your thoughts into something very strange, foreign, and often very puzzling.

A member of the British and Foreign Bible Society was telling us of a letter he received from his son the other day. His son is studying Latin and he'd just been to a cricket game. He wrote to his father, *sum equum cum clamor* (I am "horse" with shouting.) A bit extreme, but that's what happens when we translate ourselves as we go along. The missionary pioneers often had this advantage, that they were forced to live among the people. There was no other way out. You can't learn how not to translate by translating. You can't learn how not to be western by being western.

Therefore, the four assumptions that I want to mention are basic to any discussion that we might have. They are: 1, the mouth and ears are basic, speech is basic; hands and eyes and writing are secondary; 2, language is more arbitrary than logical; 3,

language is a mechanism, not a junk-heap; 4, it is a part of the fabric of life. That brings us back to the purpose of this conference. It's a chance to share ideas, to share experiences with people coming to it from different situations with different problems. We linguists feel that we have something to offer. We are charged with the thrill of something that is exciting, new discoveries and new developments from year to year.

In closing, I should like to suggest that there are perhaps three levels on which the problem can be approached. First is the level of analytical linguistics, the problem of those statistically rare missionaries who have to reduce the language to writing and prepare a writing system, or missionaries who have to prepare language courses and who need a rather good foundation in technical linguistics. Second is the level of the typical missionary going to one of many language areas of the world in which he may not have a linguistically adequate language course of study when he arrives on the field. For him there can be training in how to learn a language, how to apply linguistics to a language learning situation. In a practical way learning to use something of linguistics to learn the new language. The third level can be the level of the soundly constructed language courses for each of the major languages of the world, constructed in such a way that they are useful to the missionary and will provide for him an efficiency of learning which he hasn't had up to the present.

DISCUSSION

AUDIENCE: I have had an experience just in the last few weeks of young people who have gone out very recently after having had some training in linguistics, running into exactly the situation you have been defining, of Mr. Linguist and Mr. Missionary. How can you save these people whose spirits are being broken by the present situation?

SMALLEY: This is a very serious problem. I faced it myself. I was a little freer than many missionaries because I was slated as a specialist. The Bible Society has undertaken a world-wide campaign of educating the missionary constituency of the Bible Society as to what constitutes translation. That includes the missionary and the national who are concerned with translation matters. So I think we are going to have to in some way under-

take a world-wide campaign to educate the people responsible for conducting language learning programs as to what is involved in learning a language.

AUDIENCE: How shall we avoid frustration? It seems to me that even with the best of methods, the most up-to-date methods that you linguists may be able to provide us, and which I think we should make good use of, we still have the pitfall of frustration ahead. Perhaps it arises from the fact that we're adults, we're eager to get to the task, we haven't got time to play on the other side of the fence.

SMALLEY: Let me give you just one case briefly in illustration. A girl was studying French in Vietnam, but had nobody to talk to habitually except people who spoke French badly. She had a teacher who was a very nicely educated gentleman but who didn't know what he was doing. Frustration got to the point where she was very close to a nervous breakdown. At that point, the mission asked me what I could do about it. I didn't have much time but what I did do was to sit down with the Frenchman and take a text book which had some excellent conversational material and some good drill. I recorded those on tape and gave her the tape. The first week I went in each day for about ten minutes, showing her how to drill. She had been studying, but things were at loose ends in her mind. All I tried to do was fix something, to make something habitual for her. The difference in her temperamentally, in every way, was very marked within just a very short time, because she felt that she was doing something. She felt that she had gotten somewhere. This is a very important problem and we face it everywhere.

AUDIENCE: This matter of new language techniques and getting along with older missionaries, implies a general relationship between the older and younger missionaries. Some of the problems are in the fact that new missionaries build up ideas of what a missionary should be like and then find that there are tensions and problems on the mission field which they hadn't expected. I think new missionaries should be warned of what they will find.

SMALLEY: I had been warned but those frustrations were still pretty horrible.

AUDIENCE: I think some of these special term missionaries that have done especially well at language learning have not gone at it with the seriousness of regular missionaries. For many of them it has been sort of optional, and so it's been fun, and they have worked at it with a zest. Some of the persons putting their lives into the situation have gone in with such an intensity they haven't relaxed enough. Maybe some of you folks have got to work out a pattern here for relaxed determination.

AUDIENCE: That is precisely what some of us are trying to do. If you were to interview mission candidates before they sail, before they have had any contact with the field whatsoever, I think that one of the things that you would find they are most afraid of is language learning. They've got good reason to be afraid of language learning. They had two or three years of high school French and they can't speak a word of it. Now they know they have got perhaps six months or a year of language study. More than that, they are going to have some exams and they have heard somewhere or other that these exams are rather difficult. If they couldn't get French in three years, how can they ever get this language in half a year? I think that in many cases, the thing that is called for more than anything else is some kind of experience before they go, either with the language they are going to learn (which often isn't possible), or maybe even preferably with some other language, any language, to give them an experience of actually learning a language so that they know that they can do it.

AUDIENCE: Do you have any opinion you could give us of the Berlitz method?

SMALLEY: The Berlitz method varies tremendously, depending on where you find it and who is teaching it. The "Berlitz method" is extremely flexible. They usually put a great deal of emphasis on the use of the language. The guidance which they give often ranges from mediocre to horrible. There may be no guidance at all, or just a matter of throwing some language at you that is not even realistic. But it does have the advantage that they do require you to use the language. Speaking from the linguist's standpoint, it is not really an efficient approach. We feel that before you teach a language efficiently, you should have a

detailed understanding of the structure and its difference from English. Even though you don't teach the students that detailed knowledge, you have to have it in order to prepare the course.

The Linguaphone course is nice to have. It's wonderful to listen to. It's useful from that standpoint, but it's not properly organized. It's not efficiently presented. You can get courses on records for some languages that are fairly efficiently presented, that belong to this type of language teaching that we are talking about.

AUDIENCE: I am wondering whether you can develop real facility in a language in one or two years of language study, whether it will stick in that time.

SMALLEY: I think you should keep your study up forever. But it depends on what you mean by "stick". There are certain types of habits which you should get within the first three or six months or you'll never get them. You should get them so thoroughly that you don't even know that you have them. You won't improve on them after that time. When it comes to extending your knowledge of the usage, the idiom, the ways in which new words are used, realms of usage and vocabulary into various parts of the life and culture of the people, your study should keep on forever. Actually, our study of English does. We're constantly meeting words in new situations. We don't think of it as such, but it is language study, as we learn to assess what a new word means in its context. We're meeting new words and we feel what they mean, we sense what they mean by their context. That's language study. That kind of language study should continue forever.

AUDIENCE: What is considered by linguists to be the most difficult language that missionaries have to learn?

SMALLEY: It depends on what you mean by difficult and what you are talking about. Do you mean pronunciation? Do you mean grammar?

AUDIENCE: I mean to have a natural use of the language so that you can present your message.

SPEAKER: Well, then it will depend on what you are, what your background is and what you find difficult. It is an impossible question to answer for everybody. Some languages which are

used as illustrations of very "hard" languages for English speaking people to learn, (notice I said English speaking people because your native language is the biggest factor) are languages like Navaho. I consider some of the Nilotic languages in the class of Navaho so far as difficulty of learning is concerned, but those are always impressionistic judgments. Some people may find mimicking pronunciation very easy and they may learn to say things that anybody else can say in a very short time even though they can't handle the grammatical forms. Other people may learn to put words together very nicely and pronounce them horribly, and never really get the pronunciation right. There are so many different factors in language learning, each of which is difficult in a different way for different people with different backgrounds, that it is an impossible type of question to answer really objectively.

WELMERS: I think there are also tremendous differences on different levels of learning different languages. If you were to ask me to put on a demonstration of language learning and I wanted to make an impression of how in fifteen minutes people can really say things intelligibly without ever having heard the language before, that language I think would be Japanese. But I dread the Japanese classes in the twenty-second week. That is when Japanese is really tough. On the other hand, all the difficulties of Chinese seem to me to be in the first few weeks and after that it is simple, relatively speaking.

SMALLEY: Now he is talking from a linguist's standpoint, who has separated writing from speech.

AUDIENCE: When there is a difference between the written and spoken language, what do you do, for example, with a language like Arabic? The spoken language is one thing and the written language is practically a different thing.

SMALLEY: We call those differences differences of dialect. Even though the same person may use them in different situations, we say that they are two different dialects. And if you want to do both, you have to learn both dialects. And for most languages, there are several such dialects. One thing you must remember, you hear only one dialect at a time. You begin with the current spoken language as the dialect that you learn first, because that

is the one you use every day. That's the one in which you can really assimilate the life of the people. It is much easier then, having had a good start in this colloquial dialect, to learn other dialects in relation to it.

There are tremendous differences between languages in the way in which their writing systems represent them efficiently. Some languages have writing systems which represent them fairly efficiently. Others don't, English being one of the best examples. The more efficiently the writing system does represent the language, the more quickly it is brought into the teaching. The more remote the resemblance between the writing system and the language, the longer is the time waited before the writing system is brought in.

AUDIENCE: Is there a difference in people with respect to learning the writing? By this I mean, can some people learn a language more easily than others because they remember an image through the eye while there are others who have a greater ability to hear? Is this a part of the problem?

SMALLEY: It is inevitable that in any learning situation the student is the biggest factor. I don't have a great deal of experience myself in the question of how students learn writing systems, but I am sure that there is a difference in this respect just as it is true in their learning phonetics or learning pronunciation or in putting words together or make up sentences or anything else. It is inevitable that there are individual differences and that creates some of our problems.

AUDIENCE: I have a question on this learning situation. You spoke of the children playing by the fence and their advantage over the missionary with his books inside. You spoke, too, of the danger of the missionary not having supervision when he went out into the village. Now the children have had no supervision. In what sense, then, is that an advantage over the missionary.

SMALLEY: There are a great many differences between the child in his play and the missionary in that field situation. For one thing, up until a certain age the child has abilities of assimilating another language which are lost as a person gets

older. Up until about fourteen, any child will learn nearly perfectly any language if he is put in that cultural situation completely. An adult will not. He will always carry a foreign accent, some trace somewhere with him. There are differences. The child's learning is of the Mr. Goldberg-Mr. Frenchman type. He finds a word or a phrase or an expression used in a situation. From the situation he learns to use it in the same place and the same way. If he makes a mistake, it doesn't make any difference. But when Mr. Frenchman makes a mistake, it does make a difference. Because more is expected of Mr. Frenchman. Another thing is that the adult doesn't have as much time to spend. The youngster spends years doing that. The adult can't afford that time. Another difference is that the adult has better powers of analyzing and classifying information that comes to him. It would be inefficient for him simply to be thrown into that new situation without guidance, because he could learn a lot faster if he had proper guidance. The adult and the child are not really completely in parallel situations. Our answer is that we want to put the learner in the proper field situation so that he can hear this language around him all the time. As he is in it, we want to guide him step by step, to keep a check on him so that we know where he is getting off the track and we can construct drills that will get him back on the track. We want to know what the differences are between this language and English so that we can emphasize and construct learning materials which will help him to overcome the difficulties and will ignore the places where there are no difficulties for him.

AUDIENCE: In Japan there was a Swedish missionary, an English teacher, who had a little girl about three years old. We visited in their home. She would speak to us in English, to her parents in Swedish, and the rest of the time she spoke Japanese. Her father said, "You notice that she speaks correct Japanese." Of course I didn't know Japanese well enough to know whether it was correct or not. But it was interesting that he said, "We don't speak correct Japanese but she does." I marvelled at the ability of that child in going from one language to the other so easily at that early age.

SMALLEY: They were all native languages to the child.

AUDIENCE: Concerning the linguistic ability of an individual, is there a time when age becomes a dangerous factor? Is there any loss of ability around the age of thirty-five?

SMALLEY: I think the whole problem has been seriously exaggerated in some ways. The big change comes at about twelve, thirteen, or fourteen. If you could send him before then, he would learn the language! Beyond that, it is an individual matter and a matter of training and background and experience. If you have a person who has learned language after language after language, when he gets up to sixty he will have no difficulty learning a new language. But some people definitely find it harder the older they grow. It's partly a psychological problem. There are probably other factors involved.

AUDIENCE: After the age of twelve or thirteen the child begins to comb his hair, look at his appearance, think of what appearance he makes, and he begins to consider that appearance in relation to others. At nine or ten he can fall off a bicycle and get up and get back on and start off again. At fourteen or fifteen he can fall off a bicycle but he is ashamed that this is the case. At twenty-five or twenty-six he may not even get on a bicycle because he is afraid he will fall off and make a fool of himself. It is exactly the same situation in language learning. The little child is humble enough to be able to make mistakes and forget about it and go on. But the older missionary comes in and wants to be letter perfect before he can ever open his mouth. So he gets a grammar book or something else, and this is supposed to give him a shortcut. It seems to me it is related not to age at all, but toward our basic attitudes of getting into the mind of the people.

SMALLEY: Dr. Pike used to say, "better make a fool of yourself while you are learning the language instead of making a fool of yourself all the rest of your life."

AUDIENCE: One of the differences between adults and children is that when an adult hears a language he hears the first three syllables and he thinks, "What does this mean?" He literally hears no more because a curtain comes down and he is puzzling about what those first sounds mean. Whereas a child will hear a lot and not worry. When we were on the continent of Europe

my son came back to his mother one day and said, "What does this mean?", and he repeated a sentence of about thirty syllables. She said, "Where did you hear that?" "On the street yesterday." He didn't worry about the grammar or the meaning or anything. He just remembered all those syllables without any curtain coming down.

SMALLEY: What we try to do in these guided language courses is to teach in terms of these big, meaningful utterances and the way in which they are used. Not how you translate them, but how do you use them? Where are they used? When are they used? How are they used? Why are they used? Why in terms of the cultural situation, not in terms of any logic or anything like that.

AUDIENCE: I'm a personnel secretary. I bear down as far as I can with administrators and with people on the field for this type of language study in this country. We have a few brilliant examples of young people who with brief instruction or more extensive instruction get to a country and do exceptionally well in the language, but the picture is quite spotty. Now I have recently been in a meeting where we tried to check with people from these countries, specifically Japan and Korea, asking, "Is there any difference between the people who have studied under the best instruction in this country for a year and you people who went out to Japan with instruction that would not be regarded linguistically as good?" The missionaries that are supposed to know say that they don't see any difference. The same thing has happened in Korea. At the beginning of these studies some of our people who went through Chinese performed brilliantly when they got to China. I remember one man who took a year at Yale, got to China, was greeted, and lo and behold, he stood up and returned the speech in Chinese. Everybody was amazed. It was very good Chinese, and he had been in China only a few hours. If we had that thing repeated, I wouldn't have any problems. But it is not repeated. Over and over, I have to keep battling with this thing. It could be that we've just had a string of poor students going through some of these schools. I still feel that we've got something of a job of assembling evidence in some way.

SMALLEY: We recently sent out seventeen letters to young people who took the linguistics course in Toronto in 1954. We have ten replies. There hasn't been time for them all to come in. They all speak very highly of the linguistic course and what it meant to them. A number of them have said that as they compare their situation in Tokyo and in Puerto Rico with others who have not had such preparation, they feel they are far ahead. That's one thing. On the other hand, especially from India, we get the reaction that the instruction they have received here and the teaching they are getting there are so diametrically opposed that they are frustrated and their teachers are also frustrated. We have to get back to the field, to the language committees and language teachers and help them to understand what it is that we are trying to do. They start with the grammar, and base their examinations on it. So the students come up at the end of the year and can't talk. Then they feel frustrated. My observation so far is that the people who have a linguistic background are far ahead, and they certainly don't feel this sense of frustration in Tokyo or Puerto Rico.

GLEASON: I was talking two weeks ago with a professor from the University of Pennsylvania. He was very much distressed about two couples who had been there last semester studying Hindi. The Board who sent them there is not represented here so I shall not mention it. They had come down there to learn a language. They absolutely refused to take anything except the Hindi course. They have a good center of Indian studies at that institution, and the professor thought that (a) they were wasting an excellent opportunity to get something else they needed, and (b) they couldn't effectively get Hindi in that kind of half-hearted way, that they needed the culture to go along with the language. In not a few instances, friends of mine in other institutions have had missionaries and army people in the courses and have been distressed by the poor attitude toward language learning that the missionaries have had. They look on the language work as something that has to be gotten over and done with. With this attitude they are not going to get anything out of a course here or abroad.

SMALLEY: Missionary students in general have to be convinced of the immediate practicality of what they are doing. Some

language courses and language teachers go out of their way to convince them. Others don't. In some cases the University where the course may be offered is more interested in linguistic problems as such than in people learning to use language. All of those factors may enter in. The *why's* of the failures is a problem that we need to study very seriously.

AUDIENCE: I hope one of the things we will get to is how the best of our linguistic knowledge and approaches can be made available to the language study centers on the field. To me, that is the key to much of this problem. I've just come out of a conference, you see, and as I have talked with people from Japan and from Korea, they welcome help of this sort. I think that somehow out of a conference like this, there should be a sharpening of thinking that can go back to the mission boards and to the National Christian Councils in the different countries, as to what can be done so there can be unity between what is done here in the way of basic linguistics as a start on the language and what is done on the field.

TRAINING PROGRAMS ABROAD

CHAIRMAN—J. MAURICE HOHLFELD

Professor of Linguistics, Kennedy School of Missions

This morning we have gathered our participants from overseas, and we want to talk about some of their experiences in language learning. How did they go about the problem abroad? We are not interested in how they learned any languages here in the States, but how did they go about the problem on the field? Some of these people have had to learn two languages, a government language and a tribal language or a trade language. We have tried to make up a representative panel of certain areas of the world. Mr. Loehlin from India went to the Landour School, Mr. Orjala is from Haiti, Mr. McKaughan has been in the Philippines and in Mexico, Miss Keyes has been in Congo which also means that she had to go to Brussels first before she went to Congo, Miss Black has been in Liberia where they speak Liberian English, and Miss Robinson has been in Algeria where she, too, has had two languages, French and Arabic. Miss Black, I would like you to tell about the language school you went to in Liberia, the "School for African Linguistics" (?) in Liberia.

MISS BLACK: I think Mr. Hohlfeld is joking when he called it our "African Linguistic School" in Liberia. English is the national language of Liberia. But we live in the interior and there the people speak a tribal language in our area called Mano. When I first went out, there wasn't stress put on learning the language, but I wanted to learn it. I didn't know how to go about it. I went out there rather quickly, and I didn't have any linguistic training. In fact, in those days, back in the 1930's, they weren't giving much linguistic training before you went to the field even if you did have a chance to go to school. When I reached Liberia I thought I ought to learn this language. Things that sounded very similar were different. For instance, there are twenty-one different *ka*'s in Mano. And they mean everything under the sun—a certain kind of *grass*, a *fish hook*, or to *scrape* or to *pull something out*, a *crab*. It means *you* and *your*. It's a certain kind of *cola tree*. If you cut something you say *ka*. There are very minute differences in the sounds. A

few of them are exactly the same except that they have such a very different meaning. You have to tell by the context what is the meaning.

I am very fond of puzzles. So I thought I would try this puzzle. I was supposed to be in charge of the school. We had American text books. We had a reader that had the *Gingerbread Boy* in it. I thought if we could teach the Mano to read English by using the *Gingerbread Boy*, maybe he could teach me Mano by using the *Gingerbread Boy*. I took one of our smartest school boys and asked him, "Now how would you say this in Mano?" We did the whole *Gingerbread Boy* in Mano. Of course, they didn't have bread in Mano so that was bread with a Mano accent. I memorized the *Gingerbread Boy* in Mano, which didn't get me very far. I realized by the time I got through with it that it was a silly sort of procedure, because it didn't tell me the things that everybody was talking about every day.

So then I began getting a list of words. When I got the list of words they puzzled me a great deal. Somebody said that in a lot of African languages tone is significant, and I realized why it was significant. I tried to distinguish the tones. There seemed to be any number of tones. Sometimes the same word in a different position would be a different tone. It was very, very puzzling and I didn't get very far.

At the end of that first term I came home determined that I was going to find out how somebody went about learning a language that never had been written or spoken by a foreigner going in there. I came to the Kennedy School of Missions. On enrollment day they said, "What would you like to take?" "I want to take some sort of a course that will teach me how to analyze a language that never has been written." There was one linguistics course (this was in the old days). So I enrolled for it. It turned out that this linguistics course was a history of linguistics. We studied about the European languages, what the names of the different groups of languages all over the world were. But as to how they were taught or how you found out what made them tick—no!

I went to my home college, Albion College. I went to my old Modern Language teacher and said, "I'm up against a problem. We've got a language out there that I can't understand. I don't

know whether there are masculine and feminine genders or whether there is number. I can't figure it out. Can you tell me what you would do if you were confronted with a language like that?" She just threw up her hands and said, "Why no, I am sure I don't. Didn't anybody write anything down about it?" So there I was again. I went back to Liberia and I tried again.

Finally, back in 1950 I came to Scarritt. There weren't any linguistics courses until the summer session when Dr. Hohlfeld came. We got hold of one of our Mano boys who had gotten through high school by that time and we really did some constructive work. I got something down on Soundsciber discs. I got a Soundsciber through the help of the literacy organization in New York. We got it to Monrovia in the middle of the rains, and the thing died. It never reached Ganta. There is an industrial school in Liberia called the Booker Washington Institute and they had an electronics man. We asked him if he could fix it and he said, "Bring it down. I'll see what I can do with it." The next time somebody went down from Ganta to the coast, we asked him to pick up the Soundsciber. We found that the electronics man had left the country all of a sudden, and there was the Soundsciber all in pieces and nobody knew how to put it back together again. It is not together to this day. I gathered up the pieces and carried them to Ganta. By the time the term was over, the pieces looked as though they weren't worth carrying back to the States. There is the Soundsciber and my language learning help.

Now this year I have come back here and I am working in linguistics. I think I can speak Mano now. I think I know a few things about it. But that has been our language experience at Ganta. I am going to go back and our Board has said that I can put full time in language work. A few people have come out and tried Mano like I did and have given the thing up. A couple of the missionaries have just quit missions because they said that Mano is impossible. The language is not hard. It is fairly easy as languages go. I am going to go back there and we at Ganta are going to learn to speak the language, that is, if the Board secretaries keep the people coming, so missionaries can take time for language study.

HOHLFELD: Miss Black has spoken a bit about her problems in learning a language abroad. Mr. Loehlin has had the experience of studying at The Landour School in India.

LOEHLIN: My first introduction to the Landour Language School was in 1924, but before that, I think the most valuable language experience I had was at our Outgoing Missionary Conference in New York in 1923. We had one week at the Biblical Seminary with Dr. Cummings. He was the great authority on the Cummings method in India, where you learn these 300 or 400 sentences at normal speed and start right in for fluency more than accuracy. We had lessons in accuracy, also. We learned to use little mirrors, we learned to use tissue paper to get the unaspirated sounds. That was all new to me. I had studied language and linguistics in college but we got nothing of the phonetic side of it. It was mostly the historical. That seems to have been the case in those days. That one week's start really was of inestimable value. I envy the people here who can have a whole semester or two semesters of linguistics because that one week sort of opened my ears to a new method of learning languages. I got some idea of what to listen for and how to listen and how to check myself. Our experience in those days without trained language teachers was that nobody would correct us. The teachers were just too polite. So we had to more or less check on ourselves.

With that week's start in phonetics and a copy of Cummings' book called "The Direct Method," I started in the first winter, before the language school opened, with a New Testament in Urdu and one of our preachers. I picked up a good deal of vocabulary that way, and some idiom, right and wrong, but I felt I had a start. We got up to language school and we had phonetic drill there which was very valuable. During that first winter I was at Thoburn Christian College, where students were available who had some idea of learning another language. Some of them knew English. Some of them knew other languages. I had two of these students as tutors and one of the professors also. He was an expert on phonetics, on these tongue-twisters. He used to make out great pages of them, getting the sounds of the Urdu language, the hard sounds, the aspirated sounds. He was quite particular and would not let us off until we had

mastered the sounds. We'd start off one day and find that the next day we had forgotten how to make them, but he kept at it. I think that was very valuable. There were two of us in his phonetics class, tongue-twister class, and he labored with us for a solid month. I remember later I started Punjabi and some of the sounds are quite different. I could make them in Urdu by that time but I could not, having accustomed myself to the Urdu, get the Punjabi sounds. But he insisted. I remember one day he brought in a great, big, long staff and said, "Now you either learn these sounds or I'm going to use this on you." I learned the sounds, finally. When we did get up to language school they had classes in phonetics but that was only about half the year, and half the year we were on our own.

Since then, the Landour Language School has become *THE* center for language learning in Northern India. Up in Landour they teach Urdu, Punjabi, Hindi, Gujarati, and Marathi, at least, and perhaps more, depending on the demand. The effort now is to have an all-year language school; six months up in Landour in the mountains and six months in the winter down in the plains. But that has proved very expensive. They had their quadrennial meeting last September and I haven't had the reports as to what was finally decided about the winter language school. There is some opposition on the part of the missions. They want the new people to spend at least half the year in some mission station in their area so we can get acquainted with them and they can get acquainted with us. We have been doing that pretty much for the last several years. We get a trained teacher there from the language school and set him up at some station. The missionaries who are learning the language gather there at that station and have a small language school. We usually have from four to six missionaries in first and second year languages and some third year people. They work with trained teachers, which is a great advance over the old days when you sat down with a villager. That sounds very fine, but it is not a very good way for a beginner to get the language. Many of our villagers in India have two or three teeth out, and the rest rattle so much that it is very hard to tell what they are saying. So there are difficulties. I find the best people to listen to are the school boys and girls. They use a very simple sort of Punjabi and often they speak quite clearly.

We have the trained teachers down at the language school who are engaged for most of the winter months. They have tried this winter language school in Allahabad, but it proved very expensive. It was good, but some of the missions said they couldn't afford it. They had to hire the property for the whole year and use it for only half the time. I don't know what their final solution is. There is some talk about a language school the year round at Landour, which is not an impossibility at all. It is just winter with plenty of snow and cold weather. The houses could be heated to some extent at least. We are headed toward more scientific language courses in the Landour school nowadays. They have tape recorders, progress reports, and periodic check-ups on the students so they know just how they are getting along and how they stand in relation to the other members of the class.

The language problem is becoming more and more important in India—because of nationalism and the pride people have in their own national language. Our problem is not with the first year people. It is taken for granted that they shall study language for one year and do very little else except visit some of the other stations and get acquainted with the work. Our problem is with the second year people and still more with the third year. Our aim is that the major part of their time shall be on language study, on the theory that it is better to get the language right at the start. It is the hope that in the future the difficulties will have been overcome and progress will be accurate as well as more rapid than with a poor start. A winter language school would get the second and third year people away from their mission stations. They are inevitably dragged into the work if they stay in their stations.

A further problem has arisen. Now we all go out as members and workers under the Church, at the request of the Church in the Punjab, the United Church of Northern India. We are assigned to work by the Church, and we report to the Church. There is some lack of sympathy with missionaries spending a lot of time in studying the language which the Indians know. They don't see why a missionary should come out with college and seminary degrees and spend several years in learning a language that the Indians grew up with.

We are headed in the right direction, however, in India. Our Secretary said that of fifty applications that have gone in, forty-four were granted permission to enter and were new people. The language problem is there, but I think we are on the way to solving it in India. We look forward to a time when we shall produce some real scholars. That's what we need in India more than anything else. We have gotten very lax because of the wide use of English, especially in our colleges. That is passing and we are facing a day when we shall have to meet higher standards, and use the language much more than we have in the past.

HOHLFELD: Now another situation is the one in the Congo, which means that the missionary has to meet two languages, two different situations, first going to Brussels and then to the Congo. Miss Keyes, will you tell us about that?

MISS KEYES: Sometimes I think I am a little bit privileged because some of the others haven't had the same advantages that I have had along the way. I was fortunate in being very fond of French when I was in high school. I had another term of it at Yale while I was waiting to go to the Congo, and with the help of other missionaries who were willing to spend some extra time with me, I was able to continue through the year in the advanced French course which was quite a struggle at the time. In Belgium there are two French courses. If you go at the beginning of the year (which I didn't), the choice is made on the basis of a written examination, dictation, and whether you are able to make all the proper accords with the past participles of the subject and object and so on. The Belgian system of teaching French is rather traditional from our standpoint. It's not how well it is spoken, necessarily, but how well the grammar rules are followed. You have to know all the little rules that are in the book and it is quite different for those of us who haven't studied the structure of English in that way.

Then, too, in the two French courses there is a difference from the standpoint of the professors. We shuddered everytime we went to class because our professor was certainly a slave-driver and he gave us all kinds of work to do. He was also very insistent that our pronunciation be exact in class. The other professor, in what they call the "feeble" course, was very pleasant and

very kind to his students all during the year, but at the end of the year a great many of them didn't pass the course. In our class, practically everyone got through. So there was a great advantage in being able to get into the "strong" course even though there was more blood, sweat, and tears involved.

In order to keep up with the professor in the advanced course, and also for those who needed extra help in the beginner's course, you need to have a private tutor. Usually we have an hour a day or so with the tutor with help in grammar or composition or whatever help we need. In our living arrangements, we try to get as much conversation with our host as possible. The people that live in apartments by themselves are under greater disadvantage because there is more temptation to speak English. Also, for three months there is a course in teaching methods which is all taught in French for those of us who are going into educational work.

Then there is the famous examination at the end of the French course, an oral examination as well as a written one. Whether or not you pass that examination, which is largely based on grammar rules, determines whether you will be allowed to enter the colonial courses during July and August. Those colonial courses are all taught in French with the lecture method. They are followed at the end of six grueling weeks with an oral exam in all these courses. Many people don't get through these exams just because of their lack of knowledge of French. Those courses you might be interested to hear are the History of Belgium and of the Congo, the Geography of Belgium and the Congo, Belgian and Congo Laws, Ethnology, Tropical Hygiene, Principles of Education and Principles of Colonization. We are all very glad when the last examination is over and when the results are published for those of us who are fortunate to get through.

Before I left Belgium, one of our second term missionaries had come. We were asking her all about Congo. She said, "Well, I hear you have been assigned to a station where the senior missionary is of the opinion that the younger missionary shouldn't have any part in the work until you learn the language. You be smart and do just what she tells you and learn the language." I did just what I was told and I studied language without any other responsibilities for at least the first six months.

When we got there we were given a Kikongo-French dictionary and a Kikongo manual which is a Kikongo grammar for missionaries written by one of the Christian Missionary Alliance missionaries. It's a help, but it doesn't point out the fact that Kikongo is a tone language. I am somewhat envying our people who are studying here at Hartford this semester under Dr. Stenstrom and learning the differences in tone. In Congo I had a teacher, which meant eight hours of tutoring a week in the material covered in the grammar and in vocabulary, but I didn't always distinguish tone. I'm hoping when I get back I'll be a little more keen in hearing tone and be able to correct some of my mistakes. Also, in Congo I had another teacher who came to listen to me read. We read the *Gingerbread Boy* which was translated into Kikongo and the *Little Red Hen* and some of the other stories. My teacher was quite amazed that I didn't have to spell out the word because in his first grade class, they all had to spell out the words. He couldn't understand how I could read off the words that were written down.

Also, by listening to the people who worked in our homes, to the classes in school, and to the people in the hospital and trying to say "Hello" to them, I gradually picked up a bit of Kikongo. After I had been at Vonga for nine months and could get to follow the main points of the sermon, I was sent to another station where our evangelistic work is done in another language! I had to start all over again.

But I feel I have been quite fortunate in spite of the fact that there are some things I have missed along the way as far as my language study is concerned. Some of our other missionaries haven't been so fortunate, especially our medical people. For while educational people can't do much until they do learn to speak the language, a medical person has certain skills that he can use without knowing the language; so the temptation for him is to do what he can without studying the language. When a man comes in with a strangulated hernia, it is rather difficult for the doctor to say, "I'm sorry, I'm studying page 98 in the Kikongo book today. Come back some other time when I am not studying the Manual."

In our mission we feel the need for language study, but it is just a matter of lack of staff and workers. As we keep getting more

people in the Congo to carry the burden of the work that is being left undone, our people will be getting more language study. We certainly feel the need of it. It is largely a matter of personal choice, how the person spends his time, but it is a rather difficult choice for some of our medical people to make.

HOHLFELD: Mr. Orjala, let's hear about your experiences in Haiti.

ORJALA: My wife and I studied Spanish when we knew we would be going to some place in Latin America, not thinking about one of those few places where they speak French! We were appointed to Haiti rather suddenly. When we realized that our Spanish background would not be exactly appropriate and that we had not one but two languages to learn, we were rather sorry we couldn't go to a Spanish-speaking country and profit by our past experience. We went to Haiti with little French background here in the U.S.A. We took a summer course at the Summer Institute of Linguistics on our honeymoon, so that gave us a little bit of help in learning Creole when we started in on that. I think we learned Creole better than we would have if we had had no background in linguistics at all.

For our French study we started out at the Haitian-American Institute which is run by the State Department in Haiti. It's largely for teaching culture courses in American culture and American English to Haitians. They also have a few courses for Americans who want to learn French. The course started out in the typical way that courses are usually taught in high school and college here in the U.S.A. We got along fairly well at the beginning, but it was going slower than we wanted it to. It didn't quite suit our needs. So we started in with a private tutor who was a Salvation Army Captain, a native speaker of French. We worked out the course together and in some ways that helped, especially when he and his wife lived with us for about three months in our home. I think perhaps that helped almost as much as anything else, during the early period. Later on we had as our teacher, a man who was Assistant Director of the Fiscal Department in Haiti. While his method was quite a bit like the usual methods that are not based completely on modern linguistic theory, yet he was a good teacher and he used

methods which were designed to get us to talking. It helped us with our French more than some of the traditional methods we might have gotten in school before.

For Creole, we used a little book on *You Can Learn Creole*. This was a good introduction, a good beginning for us. However, we really learned Creole from the fourteen year old girl who worked for us, who didn't speak any English or French. We had to learn. I started teaching her to read, and that is mainly the way I learned Creole in those early days. My wife learned Creole by finding out how to give her instructions. Our next door neighbor spoke just a little bit of English, and so we had a talking dictionary from time to time when we needed special help. However, his wife didn't speak any English and at first didn't want us to learn Creole at all.

Several others of the elite Haitians told us, "Creole is not a language. You shouldn't bother with it. It is just slang. The people just don't know better. They ought to but they don't." This was complicated further by the attitude amongst some of the missionaries. Some of the missionaries said, "You must learn French first and not try to learn Creole until after you have learned French well or you'll never learn good French." Some of the people have learned fairly good French but they have never learned very good Creole. Then others said, "Don't bother about learning French. 90% of the people can't speak it, so just go ahead and learn Creole and later on if you can learn French that would be fine." In fact, some of them almost took the attitude that the elite Haitians were just obstinate and it was a matter of pride that they would not speak the language that everybody spoke. They weren't going to speak French to these people because they felt it was a matter of principle involved—that they should speak Creole and just wouldn't. A number of times the Haitian elite would not speak Creole with a missionary who didn't know French and would act as if they don't understand it. But it is a deeper cultural problem than that. It is based on the courtesy and the etiquette involved, especially in the elite culture.

After being in Haiti for five years I have decided it certainly is not a matter of *either/or* but *both/and*. A number of times I have had to go into a business or government office for a missionary

who couldn't speak Creole because the people would not speak with them. It is a matter of learning both of these languages in Haiti, although we use Creole perhaps 95% of the time. Another problem in learning French in Haiti is something like the story Mr. Smalley told us last night. There is little chance of speaking regularly with people who speak good French. The occasions when we speak French are usually the occasions when we *must* speak good French with the officials or perhaps with some business men, yet we don't have the chance of speaking French frequently and regularly each day with people who speak good French unless we have a regular teacher. That is one of the hindrances for the missionary in learning to speak good French.

French in Haiti is almost all learned as a foreign language because most Haitians grow up speaking Creole. In the elite homes where the parents speak French the children grow up as bi-linguals to a large extent. But that is only perhaps 5-8% of the people. The great masses have to learn French as a foreign language.

I think perhaps that sums up the situation except that Mr. Robert Hall, a linguist from Cornell, has written a descriptive analysis of Creole which is excellent for anyone who has a background in descriptive linguistics, but utterly confusing to most of the missionaries who don't. The greatest need that we have now for the missionaries' language program in Creole is for someone to write a simple introduction to Creole based on Mr. Hall's work which would be practical and also accurate from a linguistic standpoint and from the standpoint of good methods of learning the language.

HOHLFELD: We have to keep that point in mind when we talk about language techniques because many of the traditional language teachers are frustrated when they get modern linguistic textbooks. They don't know how to use them. Now let's go to a land of tension, Algeria, and see if there are any language tensions. Miss Sue Robinson who is with us has also had to learn two languages.

MISS ROBINSON: I went to Algeria as a short term missionary for a period of three years, and so my Board did not ask that I learn two languages, which is, of course, asked of regular

missionaries. But I was given the first three months of my term to devote to the study of French. Our regular missionaries go to Paris for a year of French before going to the field. As a short term missionary, I was sent directly to the field. We were given a private tutor in the town where we were stationed, a lady who had been a teacher in the French school system. She was French herself, and she speaks no English whatsoever. I certainly recommend this as a way to learn the language.

Before my three year period was over I got a fairly good grasp of French, though I have a long way to go in the language. I would recommend dramatics or dramatic ability for anyone who is teaching a language because this poor lady had to practically stand on her head to get us to understand some of the things she wanted to tell us. The first day that we had a class she went in and out of her front door about ten times before she got over to us that she wanted us to come back on a certain day! We had private lessons with this teacher for three hours a week.

I had been in training for six weeks before I went out with Mr. Stevick and another linguist-professor and a French informant. Mr. Stevick and all the other teachers had told us to "listen, don't just sit when people are talking or preaching or when there is a radio broadcasting. Don't just sit and let it flow over you and dream about something else, but listen and try to distinguish words and sounds and expressions." So I did, very faithfully. My first three months, it seems, was just one nightmare of visits in homes, people coming into our home, long teas and things of that sort. I sat up and very faithfully listened to everything that went on, and it was just one mass of sounds. But I learned a few stock expressions. I didn't want to sit up there with just a smile on my face and look completely stupid and not participate in anything that was going on, so I learned a few things, very flowery greetings and goodbyes and "so pleased to have met you." After sitting for about thirty minutes not saying a word, somebody would decide to leave and I would go through my little ceremony of saying, "It's a great pleasure to have known you," and "The pleasure is all mine." And they said, "Well, look here. She's just arrived in the country and she speaks French. Look at this." And they would start speaking to me and I didn't understand a word of what they were saying.

After this first three months we were expected to participate in the work of the station, but we were allowed to continue our French lessons, of course. I continued mine during the whole three years I was there. Also, besides these private lessons I enrolled in a night class. It's sort of a program of adult education that the French Government has in Algeria. I took French grammar for an hour and a half a week at night along with our people who spoke French but didn't know how to read and write. Then also I was very fortunate in setting up a system of exchange lessons with a French school teacher who was doing graduate work in English at the University of Algiers. I helped him with his English and he helped me with my French. He really did help me a lot, besides the contact of being with his family. I became close friends with his family.

The regular missionaries who go to Algeria are expected to learn French and Arabic or Kabyle. I am located in an Arabic section. The center where I work is right down in the heart of the Arab section of the city. Our children speak Arabic all day long. All that you hear in the street and the market and in the homes that you visit is Arabic. Though I was not expected to learn Arabic in my short term, I was interested in learning as much of it as I could, just so that I would be able to talk with the women and children who didn't speak French. The second year I was there I arranged to have private lessons in Arabic with a private tutor in the spoken Arabic, not literary Arabic. Also, I took another night at the Lycée in spoken Arabic. I continued the lessons in Arabic for my second and third years in Algeria.

We have a program of language study during the summer months in Algeria. The different missions in the country go together for a month of language study on the different levels with the three different languages: French, Arabic, and Kabyle. We have indigenous informants who work with us who are interested in conversation, as well as with people who are trying to learn the language from a grammatical point of view. The first summer that I was there they had two months of language school and I thought that was a great help with my French. One method that our professor used was having us learn French play. He thought this would be a good way for us to learn French. We enjoyed it

very much. We thought we were making a lot of progress and we were going to be real actors in French. The children of the French cook at the camp where we were having our language school would always come and stand right outside the door when we were practicing every week, and they would just die laughing. It was a comedy, so we thought we were really going over with a bang. One day someone had the bright idea to ask these children what they thought about the play. They said, "We don't understand a word you are saying, but it certainly is funny to listen to."

I think one of the things that helped me most in learning French on the field was my participation the first summer I was there with the children. I was sent to a camp to be a counsellor. When you have a bunch of little children who have to be gotten up at a certain hour, who have to be told to brush their teeth and wash their faces, and you have to direct their games, also lead them in simple worship programs, you've got to learn to speak. You just can't sit there with your tongue in your head. So that helped me quite a bit and I learned to pick up the slang expressions and things of that sort from the French counsellors who were there. After that summer experience at camp, I wasn't afraid to use the language and let people laugh at my mistakes.

HOHLFELD: Our next speaker is Mr. McKaughan who is from the Philippines and Mexico and is going to tell us about the situation there.

MCKAUGHAN: I should like to preface my remarks by saying that we're working with the Wycliffe Bible Translators. It is our method to send our people in couples—two single girls or two single fellows or a married couple to a particular place. We're working with minority groups whose languages haven't been written down. Our people have to take linguistic training before they go. We usually start out with the background of two eleven-week sessions in linguistics at the Summer Institute of Linguistics. I would like to say that taking linguistics doesn't guarantee that a person is going to learn a language. Linguistics is a help, no doubt, but if you think that you are going to send your missionaries to some place to take linguistics and make language learners out of them, some frustrations might develop afterwards, because learning is just plain work for most people.

One of the languages that I learned in Mexico is Spanish. I can't say that I speak Spanish as "she should be spoke." I learned Mexican-Indian Spanish and I learned that pretty well. This was the easiest language I had learned. I don't ever remember memorizing one word. I knew no Spanish whatsoever when I went into Mexico. Had never taken any "Fine, fine. We'll have someone for them." When the mis-They got the idea right away. As I went on into a bilingual situation in Southern Mexico, I started with an Indian informant who knew the Indian language. The primary thing in my mind at that particular time was to make an analysis of the Chatino language. Of course, I took down phrases and so on to memorize and talk with my informant, but in the village where I was living most of the people were Spanish speakers. Those Indians that came to the house were interested in speaking Spanish.

Every day consistently I went down with a group of Mexican young fellows to the river to take a swim, take a bath, and this took time because you wash your hair four or five times. I recall one of the first conversations I ever remembered. A fellow pulled out a gold watch. I should have known that he wanted to sell this watch to me, but I didn't. He talked all the way up from the river about this watch and by the time I got home the word *reloj* had occurred so many times, and *comprar* in one of its various forms, and *vender*, that I decided I had better look these forms up in the dictionary and find out what he wanted. I got the idea that a watch was *reloj* and he wanted me to *comprar* it and he was ready to *vender* it and so these were three words that came into my vocabulary in one form or another.

In that particular village, if I wanted to buy anything I had to go up to the market to buy it. I was what we call in the Philippines "ashamed" to go because there was no one there who could speak any English, and it had to be in Spanish or Chatino. I found that the Mexican merchant had to learn Chatino to carry on trade because the people never would speak Spanish to him. It was a case of learning because you had to, as various folk have mentioned here. There is a direct proportion of language learning to the amount of time that you are in the situation hearing the language. You can spend all of your time at home studying it and looking at vocabulary like I did with

Chatino, collecting words and phrases and so on and not using Chatino, and not make much progress in it. Whereas if you put yourself in a place where you are hearing the language all the time, it comes.

I moved from that Spanish speaking village up into a Chatino village that was monolingual and got into the same type of situation, where I could go to the *municipio*, the town hall, and sit around and listen to them talk Chatino. Language learning I think has a lot to do with how much you get to hear it and how much you get to use it. The ideal situation is where you do both things.

In the Philippines one of the illustrations of the best situation that we have run across is of two of our single ladies. While we are advising our people to get into these situations, they got into it by accident. I went out to the particular place and arranged with the chief to have our folk come out and live there and I said, "They would like to have someone help them in learning language and perhaps around the house." He said, "Fine, fine. We'll have someone for them." When the missionaries arrived he said to them, "Mr. McKaughan says that you want someone to help you with language and around the house. I have three children here, one boy and two girls, and they need to go to school. There is no place for them to live because we are so far away. Two of them are orphans and I am going to give you these children and they are going to teach you, live with you and take care of the situation." The girls, said, "All right if that is the way it is to be." They took these youngsters in charge. They chattered back and forth all the time. There was no embarrassment. They were youngsters of twelve, ten and eight years. They were not embarrassed in any way about talking in front of the girls. They could speak some English because they were in school. When they would tell the missionaries a word, they were supposed to get it. If they asked the same word the next day, the youngsters would say, "We told you that yesterday." These missionaries really learned language. They learned the youngsters' language. Once you can start expressing yourself in a language, you can talk with people, ask them for meanings of expressions in their own language, and you make progress. That was the best situation. If

you are in a situation where you don't hear the language very much it is much more difficult.

Of course, in our linguistic work we go about collecting materials to analyze language and we feel this is a help in our language learning in places where there are no materials whatsoever because the language has never been written down. It makes a difference, too, (it did in my own language learning) whether you feel you are making any progress or not. Those times which were most discouraging to me in Chatino, for instance, (that was the Indian language of Mexico) were when I didn't feel I was making any progress. I didn't get out and actually talk it. In Spanish I felt I was making progress because I talked it. When I got into the monolingual village in the Chatino and began to have to use and could talk it, I felt some progress was being made. This is the utopian way for learning a language that most of us can't get into.

I would like to say that in Wycliffe we have the range of people who learn language very rapidly to those who learn sounds slowly. I think we ought to keep in mind that individual abilities and individual situations are so different all the way across the world that you can't predict what is going to happen. But I emphasize that the type of situation that you are in is important. We really try to get our people into the situation where they are going to have to learn as soon as possible.

DISCUSSION

AUDIENCE: I'm curious about the relation between Creole and French in Haiti. I visited there a couple of summers ago. Having gone up to some congregations in the mountains, we were expecting some sort of French. An American missionary, who I know did not speak Creole, conducted the service in French. I got the definite impression that he was thoroughly understood and he conversed volubly with the people after the service. In fact, he interpreted for me. I know he doesn't speak Creole. Now is it possible that there are some villages where French is spoken fairly well?

ORJALA: There are always some people who speak French in the villages, unless you get into very small villages. You can

usually find someone who speaks French or who understands it well enough so that you can communicate. Dr. Hall's opinion is that there is as much difference between Creole and French as there is between Italian and Latin. That will give you an idea of how much French the Creole speaking people understand. It is an impossible situation to try to preach in French to people who do not understand, to people who have not gone to school and studied it and learned it, because they don't get enough out of it. They understand some words and some phrases and if they are acquainted with the subject that you are preaching on, they may get a general idea, but that is as far as it goes.

AUDIENCE: What about the language in public schools?

ORJALA: French is the official language and the language of instruction in the schools.

AUDIENCE: Is everybody more or less exposed to French, then?

ORJALA: No, there are only schools for about 1/5 of the children, and only 1/10 of the people, perhaps, are literate and, for the most part, literate in French. Not all of those people can really handle French well enough to call them able to speak French properly. Between 10 and 15% are familiar with French.

AUDIENCE: As a person who has learned a little bit of French and having visited there, I was able to get the drift of what was going on in familiar situations in Creole. Particularly in church I could follow the general drift of what was being said. In a new situation very often I couldn't get the point at all. It is one of the borderline cases where the relationship is close enough so that sometimes there is some communication but for all practical purposes, to think of using French entirely is really pretty far-fetched.

AUDIENCE: I would like to know a little more about the teaching method at Landour. We get certain reports that it is based on the method that Dr. Cummings worked out a number of years ago that has much in it that is basically sound. Can you evaluate it in terms of present-day linguistic procedures?

LOEHLIN: I think it is fairly up-to-date. But I am not an expert in that field. They have tape-recorders and check-ups on

pronunciation, fluency, accuracy and so on. They do have these basic readers which build up vocabulary and grammar from the simple to the more complex, which is fairly new. It is only the last three or four years that they have published the language school reading course. We ran into the difficulty of sudden shifts in the language requirements because of Urdu disappearing from our part of India and the emphasis now on Hindi. I think they still teach Urdu because they do use it around Lucnow and in many of our provinces still. Some of the Pakistani come over to the language school at Landour because it is the best language school in the north.

WELMERS: Two observations might be wise to keep in mind here. One involves the matter of the phonetic drill. I was very happy to hear about the drills that are given in India, the details of the sounds. Mention was made in this connection of the training of teachers. I don't know what training these teachers had but it is good to keep in mind that this, in its best form, is not easy to get hold of. It is extremely difficult to train a teacher.

The other observation is that teachers who have had a good deal of experience with missions may be precisely the teachers that you ought to avoid. Let me give you two illustrations. Working with a few missionaries who were expecting to go to India, I obtained the services of a speaker of Hindustani, who proceeded to outline the consonant sounds in Hindustani very intelligently. But in illustrating them he contradicted everything I had said more or less abstractly about what I knew about these consonants. He said, "These two consonants are exactly like two consonants you have in English. This unaspirated *t* is exactly like what you have in *tin*. And the aspirated *t* is exactly like the *t* you have in *thin*." The fault was the way he spoke English.

The other case was an experienced teacher, a chap from Sierra Leone, who had been on the language instruction staff of the mission there and had been among the examiners in the language which he spoke. After having demonstrated to the class that it was possible in a very short time to learn something about the tone of the language, one of the words which we soon ran into was the word for *house*. It has a very funny

consonant at the end of it and the informant was not satisfied with the way I produced that consonant. But I noticed that when he repeated it several times, he would be able to change the accentuation and apparently be able to change the tone when he was repeating the word in isolation, just as we do in English. I gathered a lot of other vocabulary, and my conviction was confirmed when I took one word that I wasn't sure how he had said. I said to him, "I will say it twice and you tell me which time it is good and which time it is bad." I said it twice (with different accentuation) and he said, "They are both all right." I said, "But they were different. One of them is like this word and the other is like that word." He smiled and said, "Oh, you'll never learn that kind of difference. We can't pay any attention to that. You'll never learn that." He was convinced that missionaries never could learn, and from then on he deliberately tried to steer me away from any attention I might pay to that. Experienced language teachers are often ones we ought to avoid.

HOHLFELD: That reminds me of the textbook the missionaries were given in Angola. It was an 1898 version and it said, "The Africans raise their voices. They inflect. But inasmuch as no European will ever learn this, we will not talk about it." That is in the preface of the book.

I should like to call your attention to certain recommendations of the Foreign Missions Conference of 1949. Recommendation 7 reads: "That the Personnel Committee in consultation with the Area Committees find ways—a) to send experts from this country to help the missionaries introduce improved methods of teaching and to interpret these methods of teaching and learning to missionaries and nationals—b) to seek to bring to this country selected nationals for training in language teaching."

Recommendation 8 reads: "Wherever possible, efforts be made to bring together on the field missionaries and church administrators for consultation with language experts to promote and increase understanding of this overall program."

Have these linguistics institutes been held? Is there closer cooperation between the field and the home? Have nationals come to this country to study linguistics? Have any of the Boards brought nationals over to study linguistics?

MCKAUGHAN: In the Philippines, the various Boards have gotten together with the desire to start a language school where missionaries could study the major languages of the Philippines. They asked me to sit on that committee and I was asked if we didn't have someone that was linguistically trained who could help in getting such a school going. I am sorry to say that my answer had to be "no". I had no time, and I didn't know of any of our folk that did have time. Here was a situation where Boards did want some linguistically trained people that would have background in doing this sort of thing. This hasn't started yet, but I think that there is in the making in the Philippines something that was recommended in '49.

So far, individual missions have tried to plan language learning schools. The Overseas Missionary Fellowship has a school in Singapore for the teaching of Tagalog for their people before they get there. They have a specific program of language learning. The Far Eastern Gospel Crusade had courses with Filipino speakers. I think they discontinued that. Different missions have been setting aside at least the first six months for language study. Some progress is being made in the Philippines toward language learning programs.

TRAINING PROGRAMS BEFORE SAILING

CHAIRMAN — H. ALLEN GLEASON, JR.

*Associate Professor of Linguistics, Kennedy
School of Missions*

We are talking primarily in this session about formal programs for the teaching and learning of specific languages. We have a group of four people, each of whom has some official connection with or some experience in a type of program. Our first speaker will be Henry Fenn of Yale University, who is director of the Yale Institute of Far Eastern Languages, an institution for intensive language training, to whom many of you have sent missionary candidates.

FENN: The program at the Institute of Far Eastern Languages at Yale consists of Chinese, Japanese, and Korean. Then we always advertise other Asiatic languages if the demand is adequate to justify putting on a course. We have taught Indonesian, Burmese, and Malay when the demand was adequate. Three or four students will persuade us to find somebody to put on that course. The main demand has been for Chinese, Japanese and Korean.

This Institute arose out of the war-time demand of the United States Army—the demand for quick teaching of the spoken language. So the stress is on speaking. That does not mean we slight reading, but we have come to this basic principle: start people with the spoken language only. We teach it through some type of Romanization. The theory is: one thing at a time, because that is the way human beings learn language naturally. After about 12 lessons of spoken language we are willing to introduce the written form in Chinese, the ideographic characters. We introduce only those characters whose meanings have already been mastered. Therefore, the reading is always behind the speaking. If you want to push it a step further, the writing is going to be a long ways behind the speaking so far as Chinese is concerned, because we recognize from the history of Christian missions in China that few missionaries have ever, in their 30 or 40 years in China, mastered the writing of the language. So that is one principle.

This whole program grew out of a type of teaching that developed during the war in which, in theory and to a certain degree in practice, a non-native linguist and a native informant were in the room teaching at the same time. In theory, the linguist pulled the information out of the informant and then interpreted that in pattern so that the learner could grasp it. That is oversimplified but that was the basic idea. This was maintained in many of our programs. However, many of the native informants little by little picked up a great deal of the linguistic analysis and took a professional attitude toward the teaching of their native language. We have several of those who have now been teaching for ten years. The linguists don't brag about being linguists any more, because these fellows can run circles around them. They both know how it is said and how it ought to be said. And they have been able to harmonize that to a certain extent.

We have a situation now where we maintain the distinction only in this way: I'll go into a classroom of 60 to 80 students and introduce a new lesson. Immediately afterwards, the class is broken up into sections of eight for drill purposes. Usually the drill teachers are natives. It is safer. But there is no sharp barrier. I have a fine Chinese teacher who can take over any time and introduce any lesson and probably do it better than I can.

We offer full-time courses only. Therefore, the Institute of Far Eastern Languages has to be an Institute separate from the academic program of Yale University. We get along harmoniously, but we cannot run the same programs. We want the student for six hours a day, preferably a minimum of 8 months. We think by the end of that time he may be fit to set foot on the soil of his chosen field with some degree of assurance.

There's one thing that we feel we can do. We can make a fair estimate as to whether a particular candidate can, in the long-run, master his language to such a degree that he will be both happy and effective in his life and work in that country. Very recently a man was sent to us. He studied with us for one term of 4 months. We finally had to recommend to his Board that he be directed to some other type of work, preferably in this country. The Board talked it over with him. We talked it over with him. We were in 100% agreement that it would be unwise to send him.

We feel that that is very important. Not only have we saved the Board a considerable sum of money. We have saved that man several years of what we might call a "mis-directed life."

That's why I am a strong advocate of starting the learning of a foreign language before you go to the field, so that you can step off that boat and immediately hire a rickshaw and buy yourself a meal without hemming-and-hawing and asking for an interpreter. We have had so much in the way of repercussion from students who have been sent out to the field and have written back, saying, "The most glorious day of my life was when I set foot on this soil and found that they understood me." That is incredible to them. After 8 months of study, the native could understand them.

GLEASON: There is one school in the country that is more exclusive than Yale, and it is not Harvard. It is the Foreign Service Institute, into which none of you can get, nor can any of you send anybody. We have invited a representative from that school, primarily because we believe that they are doing a type of language training that we ought to hear about; that we perhaps ought to emulate, even if we can't get in and let them do it for us. Mr. Carleton Hodge is head of the Department of Near East and African languages of the Foreign Service Institute of the U. S. Department of State.

HODGE: We have some things in common in that we have the same basic purpose of understanding the people to whom we are going. We feel that language is the first thing, and I do not wish to call it just a tool. We in the Foreign Service Institute have an institution which is less than 10 years old. This is a great advantage. The science of linguistics is not very old, and the use of linguistics in the teaching of languages, which is something completely different, has only taken place in the last 15 years. In 1946 Congress passed the Foreign Service Act of 1946, of which you may not have heard, and established the Foreign Service Institute. "The Foreign Institute is an in-service training organization within the Department of State directly responsible to the Undersecretary for Administration. Its primary responsibility is to furnish training and instruction at the graduate level to officers and employees of the Foreign Service and of the Department and to officers and employees of other Government agencies for

whom training and instruction in the field of foreign relations is necessary." (F.S.I. Catalog)

We have three schools and one of them is the school of languages. By the end of '46 we had a staff of 4 linguists. We now have about 17. This is not enough. We teach 20 to 25 languages and this is done in various ways. We have no one course in any given language. If you do not get the language before you start, you will not really learn it in the tour of duty. A tour of duty is often only 2 or 3 years, so it is extremely necessary, if the people are to know the language well enough to use it, that they get a real foundation before they start.

All of the linguists on the staff are responsible for the preparation of the text material. The texts are prepared with a knowledge of the structure of the language, as much as can be obtained by the linguist analyzing the language, and then presenting it in a fashion which is pedagogically effective. We must use our knowledge to gain the structure and then use pedagogic techniques, many of which have been known for generations, if not for thousands of years, in order to put across this structure. But the first thing is to understand the structure. And this must be done by a linguist.

We then use the native speaker, or an informant. We call our people "tutors" not "informants". We have linguists, we prepare the materials with the help of tutors, and then we teach the languages.

There are several different degrees of intensity. One hour a day classes, the lowest degree of intensity, (aside from someone just going off to listen to records which is really not language learning, but a sort of exposure), and then there are intensive classes which run from 4 to 6 hours a day for about 8 months. Our emphasis at the present time is on intensive classes. Obviously, all of the hundreds and hundreds of people sent abroad by the U.S. Government cannot be trained in the language of the area to which they are going, however desirable any of us might think this is. So most of our intensive trainees, or, for example, the Air Force officers who might be assigned to us, State Department-wise are what we call "area specialists" or language-area-specialists who have volunteered for this task.

We do not intend to do all of this training. We are not equipped to do it, but experience shows that the traditional methods of language learning are completely inadequate. Some schools have developed effective techniques, even though they are not entirely up-to-date. There is no school to which we may send our people for *most* beginning languages. So we teach beginning French, Spanish, German, Russian, Persian, Turkish, Arabic, and other languages. In these specialist courses, we have about 8 months in the Foreign Service Institute course. Then there are different programs available, depending on the language. In Persian, for instance, you get about 8 months of the language at the Foreign Service Institute and then the student goes off to a university for a full academic year with the stress on learning the area and doing advanced work in the language, either on his own with a tutor we might provide him; or, if the university has an advanced course, he can go into that. We use the university whenever possible.

In most cases, we must set up our own program because it is not a matter of duplication; it is a matter of unavailability. There are about 17 languages in which we offer language-and-area instruction. There are several places where we begin the language here and then continue it in the field. We have a school in Tokyo, in Formosa, and in Beirut for Japanese, Chinese, and Arabic respectively, where continued work is done after beginning language at the Foreign Service Institute in Washington.

We are concerned with giving our people understanding of the culture as well as of the language. We have another school, The School of International Studies, which deals with the culture. In many cases we depend on the universities. In the Japanese and Korean programs we do most of the area work ourselves. In certain other programs, we do very little of the area work.

GLEASON: Probably more missionaries are receiving their introduction to language through the Summer Institute of Linguistics than through any other single source. We have a representative of that group,—Mr. Benjamin Elson. In addition to his experience there, he has also been at Cornell University and can tell us something about that type of language program as well as what is offered at the Summer Institute.

ELSON: The two programs you have heard about just now are those which teach here in the States the language of the area where one is going. The courses of the Summer Institute of Linguistics are summer sessions which are designed not to teach any specific language at all but rather to prepare one for learning or rather analyzing a language which doesn't have a writing system or any textbook material about it. Our courses are in general linguistics. They are designed for people who are going to tribal, indigenous areas where they will have to give the language a written form and work out a description of the grammar and other materials.

The sessions of the Institute are held on the campus of the University of Oklahoma every summer. We also have Institutes at the University of North Dakota, and in Canada, London, and Australia. The Institute at Oklahoma lasts for 11 weeks. There are two courses and we encourage everyone to take both of them. One is *Phonetics and Phonemics* and the other is the *Study of Grammar*. There are in addition to these two courses, lectures on anthropology that are optional for those who want to attend them. The *Phonetics-Phonemics* course in the first year has an hour a day of phonetic drill. The students learn how to make all different kinds of sounds, how to recognize a tone language, etc.

As a part of this course, there is an hour a day of instruction in the principles of phonemics, which is essentially giving a language a realistic writing system, a writing system which will be most useful from the point of view of the native speaker. This particular phonemics system is not necessarily the eventual orthography which will have to be adopted for the language. All kinds of cultural factors enter in, such as the orthography of the trade language or the national language of the area. Thus a so-called "pure" phonemic alphabet frequently cannot be used. But it is good, if you are going to give a language an alphabet, to understand the phonemic principle in order to work from this to a practical alphabet.

Then two hours a day are devoted to the morphology, grammar, syntax and related subjects. This goes on for a period of about nine weeks. There is a 10-day field problem where Indians from Oklahoma, native speakers of Indian languages, are brought in.

Everyone has a chance at working with an Indian informant, asking, "how do you say chair," "table," and so on, trying to figure out in the 10-day period how this language works. This is to give some practical experience in learning a language.

There is also a second-year course which is a little more difficult and requires a good deal of outside reading as well as working with an informant for the entire summer. The language that we have been concentrating on in the last few years is an Indian language of some considerable difficulty for speakers of English. This gives an illustration of how to go about not only learning but writing up descriptive materials.

One of the things which missionaries face is a fear of the language which they are going to learn. When the formal learning situation doesn't work out well, then there is considerable frustration. It would seem that this might be mitigated somewhat by a slight introduction to language learning, enough at least to give a linguistic orientation to take away the fear of language before the candidate gets to the field. All of our people do not turn out to be expert language learners, but in general, they tackle fairly "exotic" languages that are different from those they are used to with considerable confidence, and they know that they can ultimately learn these languages. We give the students some anthropological as well as linguistic orientation—a taking away of the ethnocentric view that the only logical language is English.

The program at Cornell is geared in actually with the Cornell academic program. The chief languages taught are Spanish, French and German, although there are courses in Hindi, Indonesian, and Chinese.

The arrangement is one of six semester hours with class contact for eight hours a week. Three of these hours are with a native speaker of the language and this is primarily drill. Three of the hours are with what is called a "lab-instructor", and he uses tape recordings. Also he is a speaker of the language and conducts more drill and pronunciation practice, etc. Then two hours a week are spent in lecture where grammatical materials are pointed out. After a year of two terms of this kind of instruction, these students talk to each other in the language.

GLEASON: Our last speaker is William E. Welmers who is now a professor here and who, in addition to teaching at Cornell, has had some experience in Liberia directing a program of language learning for the Lutheran Board. He is going to tell us about a variety of programs.

WELMERS: Here at the Kennedy School of Missions, in addition to French, Spanish, and Arabic, the nature of the language teaching we do is dictated by the kind of language learning problems that exist. We are dealing with a variety of situations. Next year it is possible there will be some students who expect to learn the Loma language in Liberia. I choose this because I don't know any Loma, not more than a few words, but there is an excellent set of lesson materials written in Loma by a missionary with linguistic training. On the field he gives a certain amount of guidance to students who are using that material and makes the students work very hard. Although the experience has not been extensive as yet, it seems to be producing a certain amount of good results. Should we, then, bother with anything by way of Loma here? Yes, it is worth doing because in the kind of classroom situation we have here, we can pay more attention to certain kinds of detail, correction of pronunciation, and making students acquire certain patterns of pronunciation, than it is possible to do on the field. Most of the student's time on the field will be spent with an informant. The informant neither knows, nor to the extent that he does know, cares about this particular kind of detailed attention. He is easily satisfied. That is, he wants to please the missionary. Back here in the learning situation in the classroom we can make corrections that maybe will not be made on the field.

How do we go about it? All that we have is a textbook. In this case, I am hoping to use tape recorded material which I have asked to be sent from Liberia. If the students come, I hope to be able to give them some detailed practice particularly in consonant contrasts, matters of vowel length and tone in Loma. It will be something that they will be able to get better here than on the field.

Also, we have each year a few language classes that are organized more in traditional fashion. That is, you actually hear the language in class and you drill on it in class. We teach languages as they

are available; that is, as speakers of the languages are available and as there is demand for them. We do not say if there are 10 students who expect to be going to India, "Oh, we must teach Hindi. Where can we find a Hindi informant?" If we can find a Hindi informant, fine. We'll teach Hindi. But if we can't we may teach them Zulu. That's perfectly all right. The purpose of these courses is to give students practice in a language learning situation. And there may be some advantages in having them work for a while on languages that they will never hear again. Certainly they are not going to be afraid of that. They will be relaxed because they will never have to go to the field and make fools of themselves in this language. We have a chance to get them in that way under very favorable circumstances. However, where we can tailor the course to the needs of the students, we do.

This year we are teaching three hours of Japanese each for five Swedish students who expect to be going to Japan. We are teaching a course in Persian. There is an Iranian informant who comes up for that course. We are teaching a course three hours a week in Kpelle, another language of Liberia. We are doing a great deal of intensively guided drill. "Guided" is the big thing in this kind of program. I know it would be impossible for the students to get a great deal of fluency at this time. But I believe they can get a great deal of accuracy.

In addition, we have tutorial sections where, if a missionary feels he has a specific need and that we can give some help, we do what we can. We are working in that way on a number of other languages, in some cases by way of tape recordings.

A somewhat similar thing is being done at the Toronto Institute of Linguistics from a different point of view. The T.I.L. is designed primarily to work for a month with prospective missionaries who do not expect to be in a situation where they have to analyze a language that no one ever studied before. They are either going to a language school or going to learn a language where there is some kind of material, though perhaps not a formal school. In the course of that one month, attempts are made to do a little of actual language instruction. No particular attempt is made, because of lack of facilities, to tailor the languages to the needs of the students. At present, each student spends a little

time on one language and then a few weeks in another one, getting some kind of an idea of how you go about learning a language.

Everywhere, from the academic course in French at Cornell to the intensive language course in Japanese at Yale to the course that we might offer here with a tape recording of a language where we don't even have a translation of the materials, we try to prepare the student for his field situation; to show him that he doesn't have to be afraid of everything, that it is not something entirely frightening; to try to give him some guidance and some correction that it may be very difficult for him to get on the field; and, to give him some feeling of confidence in the language.

DISCUSSION

AUDIENCE: A good many missionaries have to spend two years learning Japanese or they would make a lot more mistakes than they do socially and culturally. How much studying should be done here and how much there, in order to get their thinking integrated to the people?

FENN: That's a problem that has been debated back and forth for many years. We argue at Yale for starting the language here and, preferably, having a minimum of 8 months. When I was running the program of the College of Chinese Studies in Peking, we had a 5-year program mapped-out, the first two years full-time, after that coming down to half-time and quarter-time, not always at the College but a mapped-out program. A missionary was not supposed to know the language before he had 5 years of at least part-time study. I find that in the field of Japanese, particularly, the older missionaries encourage the Boards to send them right to the field to get the language there. We just simply have to disagree with them. We find the probability is that there will be some criticism of our people when they arrive. They don't pronounce the words just the way that the teachers locally do or something else. But usually after they have been there 6 months, they are ahead of those who started on the field.

So far as learning customs are concerned, I grant you that there is no way of learning customs except by being right there and making mistakes. Sometimes we can orient them in the area work, but you've got to learn that by trying.

HODGE: This is just as much our problem as it is your problem and we are very much concerned that our people do not make mistakes when they go overseas. After all, every American overseas, whether a missionary or a member of any of the various government agencies, is an ambassador of America. We do our best to try to give them a feel for the cultural relativity. It is possible to give our people a training in the way other people think, the way they actually operate.

We in the language school are not equipped to do that. We are equipped to teach the language. Obviously the two cannot be separated. If you have various degrees of politeness in the language, you must use these various degrees in the proper situations or you are going to be a bore. As much as possible of this instruction must be put across before the person lands in the other country.

HOHLFELD: When I was visiting a mission in Angola, a veteran missionary said, after commending a visitor who had been in Angola about two weeks, "I never knew that I could be out here so long and miss so much, because I didn't know what I was looking for." That is what we are dealing with in these language problems and in anthropology. If we can train our people to know what to look for when they get there, we will have done much for the good of the cause. Unlearning is a painful process. If you don't get the right pattern in the first few weeks, you may never get them.

GLEASON: We offered in the Kennedy School of Missions a course the first semester which was called "Linguistic Problems of Africa." The purpose of the course was to try to help the students with some of the specific things that they were most likely to run into in African languages as opposed to languages in some other parts of the world. We may be able to expand that kind of thing in various schools and in various ways in the future, where the student can get a sampling of problems from ten or a dozen languages. Many of the problems of the language he is going to work on, though we don't know anything about it, are going to include at least some of those, and it will give him some insight. This is something a bit more specific than the linguistic course that of necessity must try to cover anything that conceivably can be imagined and the other extreme of the course that applies only to the specific problems of a certain language.

LINGUISTICS AND TECHNIQUES OF LANGUAGE LEARNING

CHAIRMAN — WILLIAM E. WELMERS

Associate Professor of Linguistics, Kennedy School of Missions

Our panel will discuss programs that have been developed for training missionaries in language analysis and language learning. Mr. Earl Stevick is from the Scarritt College for Christian Workers, Nashville, Tennessee, and has had some acquaintance also with the program at Cornell University.

STEVICK: It needs to be mentioned very explicitly that you mustn't give us professionals in the linguistic field too much credit for being able to simplify problems on a practical level. We do not have any method and do not expect to find one that will enable a missionary to learn a language without work. You must work at learning a language but whether you have any results is another question. We think that we are a little more likely to get results, but work, and hard work, is something that we are always going to have.

Second, even assuming that we are going to have to do a lot of hard work, please remember that the linguist or the linguistic analyst does not, in producing his linguistic analysis, at the same time arrive at a single, unmistakable method by which his analysis must be interpreted. We can't produce a royal road and we can't even produce an unmistakable method.

What are we good for? One thing that we as linguists can do is to sort out the various structures and sub-structures of different methods and present them in a way which is much clearer than has been done before. Mr. Smalley said that language is a part of the fabric of life. It is an intelligible structure, and we must build methods from there. What we have is not a method. It may be an approach. It may be a way of going about this sort of thing.

Linguistic training can prepare people to adapt techniques of language learning. We can give them an idea of some very fundamental things. For example, what is language? What is language learning? What is language teaching? This can be done on any scale, but the purpose of it is as though you were giving

a student a map of the language. And you are saying, "Here are some of the kinds of terrain that you may come across. Here's the place that you want to get to. You are going to be flown over this terrain and dropped somewhere; we don't know where. In other words, you might be dropped in this kind of school or that, with a good teacher or a bad one. As soon as you get your bearings, we're going to show how you can go from wherever you happen to find yourself to wherever you need to go."

This is what I mean by teaching an approach. I don't think we can give them *a* method, *a* technique. We have to give them an approach. The more training one has had in more languages, the more types of terrain one is accustomed to dealing with, the more efficiently one can work.

WELMERS: Mr. Howard McKaughan has been working as a linguist primarily at the Summer Institute of Linguistics and also at North Dakota.

MCKAUGHAN: I think that everyone recognizes that a person who is going to prepare materials needs some linguistic orientation. We are suggesting that the linguistic orientation needs to be amplified and he needs to have more than just courses in language learning.

As far as the Summer Institute courses are concerned, the most valuable course that we give for language learning is the drill sessions in phonetics, learning to make different sounds, learning to develop flexibility in the mouth and the ear, and writing down these sounds. This is the most applicable thing that we have as far as language learning is concerned. But we are specifically set up to work with language analysis. The Institute was started in order to prepare to do Bible translation work.

In North Dakota we have an area program that we give in an advanced course. We give the first year courses in phonetics, phonemics and grammar, but in the second year courses there is an area emphasis on the South Pacific; namely, the Philippines. Our emphasis even in that has been on analysis rather than on linguistics to be able to put pedagogical materials across.

I cooperated with one of our members in writing some material with Professor Hockett at Cornell on Ilocano. We wrote it specifically for linguistically-oriented people, so we used linguistic terminology when we described the structure. Although we had basic sentences to memorize and drills set up so that a person without any linguistic knowledge could use the material, it wasn't nearly as valuable to them as it was to a linguistically-oriented person.

In our program at Cornell, we don't try to orient the people taking French, Spanish, or German in any general linguistics. However, some of these people would be doing better if they had some linguistics to get them oriented in language learning.

WELMERS: Among others of Mr. Smalley's accomplishments has been his connection with the Toronto Institute of Linguistics. This institution was started some years ago with the idea of giving a month for orientation to people who are going to use another language.

SMALLEY: I want to try to show you how the Toronto Institute of Linguistics attempts to take an extremely technical field like linguistics and interpret it in a month's time in a practical way to people who aren't interested. In most cases, the missionaries are sent to the Toronto Institute by their Boards because their Boards have been influenced to believe that it is important that they get some linguistic orientation. Many of them come skeptical, many of them are not inclined to do much work. Without exception, last year their attitude changed within a few days so that they were all working, and in almost every case enthusiastically, on technical linguistics. But they didn't know that it was technical linguistics. Of course, it was only the very fringe of technical linguistics.

Our purpose at the Toronto Institute is to try to give outgoing missionaries who are going to the better-known languages of the world, who don't really need analytical techniques, something of an idea of what makes a language work. Something of an idea of what to do if you don't get a good teacher. Something of how to put the material together in a way that you can learn it more efficiently than you can with the typical junk-heap that you usually have. To do that, we try to introduce them to how

languages are put together. The linguists among us would shudder when I say that this is done in about 10 hours, but it's all we can afford. We try to teach them about how sound systems work and how grammatical systems work in general.

Then we try to give them some very specific skills, skills without which they can't do an efficient job. We try to get them to develop some phonetic skills—not in a sense that we have a list of sounds that we are going to teach them. We do have sounds that we practice on, but we try to bring them to a point where they know enough about the human speech mechanism and have had enough practice with all sorts of combinations that we don't normally use in English. We work hard on developing in them the sense of the importance of mimicking, of making fools of themselves for the time being.

We have drill sections in which we work both on phonetics in the abstract, such as taking particular types of sounds from different languages and working on them, nonsense syllables and different types of phrases and sentences. There are drill sections in which we take languages (last year two different languages were worked on in sequence) in which they start in as though they were going to learn that language in earnest. They drill sentences; they practice just as though it was their first day of work on the field.

Then we try to show them how they can organize study. We give them some hints, if they do meet a junk-heap approach in the field language program, how they can take this junk-heap and out of it get something which is more efficient. We try to warn them about the difficulties that they will face, many of them with their language tutors. In our catalog it says that we give some attention to the handling of teachers. That is extremely important, helping these tutors to give our missionary students what they really need.

Our daily schedule is something like this: a period of an hour of phonetic drill on new material. We make a diligent attempt to orient it to real language situations to make it as realistic as possible, to make it as practical as possible. Then an hour of drill on old materials. An hour of drill on this practice language. An hour of lecture and problems work: how language

works, what is its structure, what structures means, what words like "phoneme" and "morpheme" mean. We don't dwell on such technical words for the sake of learning technical words, but because we can learn some important things about language structure through the use of a very few, a limited number of technical words. The fifth hour deals with the relation between language and communication, between culture and language, anthropology, the relation of language to literacy and literature, and other practical matters.

In the last week the course changes drastically. Dr. Nida comes up, and if you know him, you know that automatically things change at that point. He devotes two hours a day to lectures in his own way on problems of communication, culture, translation, and language in missionary life. It makes a very fine closing to the session. Then between times the students come out and do some more drill work.

All the things that we have been talking about here at these sessions are experiments. They are things that we have been working with; that different people in different parts of the world have been working with; the things that have been producing results; but they are nothing fixed and final at all. There isn't a person that has been working along these lines but has changed his mind a hundred times in the course of it and is developing and progressing and making improvements yearly. The Toronto experiment is an experiment. It is building up a tradition, of course, over a very short history of five or six years; but it is an experiment which changes from year to year as one thing is tried out, and, if it is useful, is adopted and further developed; and, if it is not useful, is discarded. This experiment has a very important place to play as a sort of measure between the area where the individual needs a specific and highly technical training in linguistics for a specific and highly technical job and the area where the individual can avail himself of a fully developed and adequate course in a particular language.

WELMERS: Professor Gleason, our last member of the panel today, has had most of his experience in teaching linguistics right here at the Kennedy School of Missions.

GLEASON: It has always seemed to me that there are three major determinants of a person's success or failure with language

learning. One is the language that he is going to learn. The second one is the language or languages that he already knows (the plural is irrelevant in the case of most of our candidates). The third one is the attitudes that he has toward language in general. I would hesitate to say that courses in linguistics can overcome students' fears of language and their frustration and their general feeling that it is impossible for Americans to learn languages. Courses in linguistics can help to develop attitudes.

The troubles that arise from the language the candidates know, English, is largely from what they don't know about English. We all know English, we operate with it. It is surprising, to anybody who ever stops to think about it, how early people do learn very complex facts about English. But to verbalize those facts, to be conscious of them, and above all, to be conscious of the fact that they are English, is another problem. One thing that is needed is more information for our mission candidates about English.

Therefore, we have found it necessary to spend a certain amount of time that we have in linguistic courses to pointing out some of these things. For example, making people aware that there is an intonation system in English. That the intonation system is in *English*, and not just in human nature. Some idea of how it works, and that there will be differences elsewhere. That is one of the things that we feel is necessary. Part of the reason that this is necessary is because of the naïvete of the English teaching through which they have gone. At a conference of college English teachers this spring, everybody wanted to know, "How do you teach structure?" There will be a change, but right now people come with such poor knowledge about English that we must give this to them.

The next point can be illustrated from that well-worn story about the backwoods American who went to the circus for the first time and saw the giraffe and said, "There ain't no such animal." That is paralleled by a student receiving an elementary introduction to a language. She wanted to know about the articles. I said, "There isn't any article." "There has to be an article," said she. I replied, "The fact of the matter is that in this language there isn't any article." She looked straight at

me and said, "You're just hiding it from me. There has to be an article." It was no conspiracy—unless it was a conspiracy of the speakers of this particular language.

The one way to get around this is to let people see a variety of things. Let them see languages with articles, without articles, with more articles than there are in English; without plurals and with three kinds of plurals instead of one; and all kinds of items. They don't have to get a very good look. Just going through a picture book of the animals of the world would have helped that farmer a good deal. Just a casual glance at a wide variety of languages would have helped that student if she would have believed what she saw.

The next thing that people who are going to learn any language need is a bit of the techniques of analysis. I tell my students over and over again, "There is no need for most of you to have the ability to produce an analysis that could be published in a linguistic journal, complete with all the gobbledygook to which we are professionally addicted. But it is necessary for you to be able to figure out certain little parts of structure here and there, for the simple reason that almost everyone of you is going to be faced with learning languages in which not all of the pertinent information is available to you in predigested form." This is true even of those languages where the text books are copious and have been through many generations of revisions and rewriting. It is true even for the person who might perhaps get into a course where everything that he needed to know about the language he is learning was taught him. Because he is going to find that when he gets on the field, he has to learn the village language. There is no textbook for that. We are all going to have to do some analyzing. Children do it the long, hard, slow way. Adults can, too. But the rational adult is rightly impatient with this, and he wants to get at it a better way.

There are many people who don't like this. But on the other hand, some people do. I had one student who enjoyed doing the problems that were set for him. The end of the course came around and he said that he had enjoyed those problems a great deal. He was going to be sailing soon and would have a long period on the boat. He had originally thought he would take a cross-

word puzzle book but he thought this would be more fun. What could he do? So I gave him a copy of Nida's "Morphology" and he went off happy.

The third thing that we try to put into our elementary linguistics course is some information about specific techniques of language learning. Unfortunately, we don't know much about this. Linguists in general have been more interested in language than in how to teach language, and more interested in how to teach language than how to learn language. But we do have some information and we try to relay what we have found. This means telling them how to know when a textbook is good and when it is bad. We can't always tell, but sometimes they are bad enough so that it is obvious and we can point out the earmarks. In the event that you have a poor textbook, then what?

If you are a professional linguist you forget about the textbook and you go ahead and learn the language. We try to show them how to take a textbook and an informant and make the best out of a bad job and improve it. For example, in my lecture yesterday, I took Lesson 1 from a high school Spanish textbook. We spent the entire hour going through that lesson showing what was wrong with the way it was organized and how, for example, if the material was studied in exactly the opposite order from what the book directed, you would be better off. We are trying to take this technical information and bring it to bear on the kind of situation that the student will find himself in. This is a difficult proposition because the situations are various, the students' abilities and interests are various, but there are some things that can be done.

From time to time, Board secretaries have asked me, "Do you really believe that courses in linguistics of this sort will actually speed up the student's acquisition of the language?" My answer is, "Frankly, I don't care much." Because as I see it, the objective here is not to speed up language learning but to *improve* it. The problem is not that people take too long to learn a language but that they don't do a good enough job. Now to be sure, if we can turn out a person who can do the job in one month less time than he could have done otherwise, this is worthwhile. But the thing that we are really after is that in

whatever time he may have at his disposal for language learning, he can do the best possible job. That is, he can come at the end of it to the nearest proximation to a native command of that language. Even in the best situations you will find that the big trouble *is not insufficient but inadequate language learning*. Adequate language learning can never be gotten at all unless you are willing to sit down and face the questions: what is a language? How is one language related to another? What does a language do? You've got to face the problems of general linguistics. If missionaries are content to be able merely to tell the story of the *Gingerbread Boy* in Mano or Chinese, then general linguistics is not a particularly pertinent subject. If they want to be able to take a passage, oral or literary, in another language and really understand what goes on; if they want to get a thought across, a simple thought or a profound one, to speakers of another language; then they have to know, not just some little techniques, but they have to know what goes on in a language. While linguists don't have all the answers, they do have a few of them. They have something that is worthwhile in and of itself, apart from what it can contribute to language learning.

DISCUSSION

FENN: I have been very pleased in these sessions to hear an echo of my own feeling that there are two problems—the problem of teaching a language which is already very well-organized and then the problem of preparing someone to pioneer in a language which has not yet been so organized. I am concerned at Yale primarily with languages which are well-organized. The suggestions here would indicate that in dealing with such languages it would be wise to have a minimal course or introduction of linguistics. I very heartily agree. But I'm up against a situation where I would like to bring something into a course that is already crowded. Maybe I am too naïve in thinking that is practical.

HOHLFELD: A missionary was sent to a language school to learn Chinese. After three months, the Board was informed not to send this man to China. "He will never learn a tonal language. Send him to some other area where they don't use a tonal

language." The poor fellow was all upset and frustrated and the Board decided to send him to Malaya. Before he left, the Board directed him to a missions school. After he had some instruction and drill sessions in tone, in African languages first, it dawned on him. At the end of the semester he said, "You know, I would never have flunked Chinese if I had had this first." He has done well in Malaya and has since learned Chinese.

PANEL: I think that this highlights something that we might mention in passing, that our general linguistics should be coming in undergraduate days. Before people take French and Spanish, before they come to the Seminary Greek and Hebrew, they ought to have general linguistics.

AUDIENCE: The practical problem that confronts us as candidate secretaries is that our candidates are going overseas, whether we like it or not, without any background whatever. Do you think it might be well to give them any textbook or any sort of written material on linguistics? Can they get some of this entirely on their own? Or would it be better not to complicate the matter at all if they haven't had any instruction? Would it be better to give them some simple material and not let them get into technical aspects at all?

GLEASON: A person who has a mathematical background makes the best linguist. You can give him a technical manual on what phonemes and morphemes are and he will catch on right away, because he finds a set theory. But for a person whose background has been in English literature, that would be very difficult.

I don't mean by this that mathematicians are necessarily the best language learners. However, that general type of training is the thing that will enable them to catch on to the technical aspects of linguistics most readily. I speak from experience in that we get students from a wide variety of backgrounds. One year we had two atomic physicists in my elementary linguistics class. In general, people who are trained in science are the ones who get the technical side of linguistics most readily. I am not sure that they all make the best language learners.

SMALLEY: You might be interested in what we are planning for Meadville, Pennsylvania this summer. It will be a two weeks

course. It's a kind of reduced Toronto program. We hope that two weeks will at least introduce people to the problem. It will be more helpful than reading a book.

AUDIENCE: Granting the assumption that the contact with an instructor is better, I would still like to know whether there is a pamphlet that can be used in the absence of the student-instructor relationship.

GLEASON: There are a few books and booklets that could be recommended. Perhaps we could make a bibliography and attach it to this report. (See page).

AUDIENCE: I am convinced from listening to this conference that some linguistics is essential for a missionary going to the field. However, there are a number who need to be convinced. I wouldn't know quite what to say to them. Is there a five-minutes message that could be given?

GLEASON: In five minutes I think you could only use the anecdotal approach and here is one. There is a language in Angola which has been described, though not very often and not very well. It is a tone language which has not been seriously recognized in that category by anyone who has published in that language. There have been several factors which have been systematically overlooked. We had a lady on our campus who is a retired missionary from that area and has quite a reputation as a speaker of that language. She is one of those people who can't stop talking, and she was quite fluent in the language. Her reaction to some accurate information about the language was, "Well, that may be, but don't tell the new missionaries that, because it will discourage them." That's the first part of the anecdote. The second part is that the informant from whom I had gotten the information was talking about the missionary and said, "When she talks the language, she is very hard to understand." That is the end of the anecdote. To state the point more briefly from another African, "You know, the missionaries come over there and they teach Sunday School. We always put them with the adult classes because the adults can wait until they get home to laugh."

WELMERS: The type of linguistic training that can help prevent ludicrous mistakes can perhaps take different forms. There was

a young lady who spent one term in Vietnam. She had learned something about what a tone language was. She was now assigned to West Africa and was about to learn a new language. She had been in the country for about a week. We were having a conference during that week and she was spending her entire time taking care of the missionaries' children. I was trying to persuade some of the missionaries that the language they were working with was tonal and that some of the difficulties they were having distinguishing between "goat" and "river" were matters of tonal distinction. I decided that the best way to do it was to demonstrate with this young lady who apparently knew something of what tone was all about. She had not heard the language yet, except to overhear a few comments, and only on the mission compound. She hadn't had a chance to go into town. I wrote out about 30 pairs of words and stirred them up in a miscellaneous order and marked them for their tone. I called her in and explained the use of the tone marks. She was to read them off and see if our speaker of the language could tell what they meant. So she read them off one by one. The informant who had worked with the missionaries for a number of years gave the meaning. Then I would check them off on my list. At the end of the experiment she had gotten through 50 or 60 forms without any error at all. The informant always gave back to her the right meaning, all words which the veteran missionaries had been puzzled about. The informant turned to one of the missionaries and said, "Mr. Adams, how is it that this young lady has come to my country this week, and you have been here 20 years, and she speaks my language better than you do?"

NIDA: One of our greatest problems at the present time is this of communication. We simply aren't getting across our message, in a cultural and linguistic context which makes sense. A tremendous amount of our very fine, well-meaning efforts as doctors, as nurses, as educationalists, as administrators is simply being lost, because we do not communicate effectively to people this meaning of the new life in Christ Jesus, which has to be given, at least to some extent, in verbal symbols. And if we are not doing that, we are failing in our calling as missionaries. We have a message to proclaim, and the basic answer has got to be in terms of reassessments of what we are going to do and how

we are going to do it, without which there is no point to our being on the mission field. It is possible to make stupid mistakes, nevertheless the average missionary candidate's reaction is, "So what? We have been making them for years." It is only the positive challenge, stressing the necessity for effective communication which is ever going to really get across to missionary candidates.

AUDIENCE: I hope we don't lose sight of the question raised at the outset of this conference of the relation of linguistics to the learning of Japanese.

NIDA: The best possible way to introduce linguistics to persons wanting to learn Japanese is in the course in Japanese. It becomes meaningful then, relevant. I can see some point to an introductory pamphlet or something of the kind on linguistics—it might be helpful to someone learning Chinese—but largely, he is not going to be able to relate it to the Chinese.

We run into the problem in Bible translating. Most Bible translators have read the book, but they haven't gotten far. So I have to sit down with them, hold them by the hand, as it were, try to explain the relevance of those principles to the exact thing that they are doing. Part of our essential jobs as linguists is not really to teach linguistics so much as to try to help people see the relevance of linguistics to the particular thing they want to learn. It is not a matter of what people *should* learn, but what they *will* learn that makes the difference.

Theoretically, we would like to insist that they learn these wonderful background things, but they won't do it. There are too many pressures on the present life situation. We simply can't expect it except of the rare person. Nevertheless, we can influence the proper application of these techniques to the actual situation whether it is a course in Japanese here, Spanish in Costa Rica in the language school there, or in some small language school in Congo. Gradually by the approach to these techniques through missionaries even in short-term courses, their reaction is going to be in another 15 years, "We must have more of that thing on the field; we must have better textbooks."

This is our infiltration technique in a circumstance in which people think it is valid. *A good course in linguistics will shorten the time as well as improve the efficiency.*

AUDIENCE: Our first practical steps would be to work on the language school in Japan. It would be practical to find some ways of interesting the heads of the language school in Tokyo to take the course in this country, a year or two, which would give them an insight into how to teach Japanese with linguistics in it, rather than separate the two. I think the Department of Missionary Personnel might very well explore the half dozen major language schools around the world. The Boards might be interested in bringing someone from Tokyo or other language schools to a school of linguistics here.

NIDA: Ideally, we should have an institution or a number of institutions which would be dealing with the description of languages to relieve the ordinary missionary of this task which he is not really interested in. He wants the language to put across his message. If we could have an institution supported in some way which would do this job, it would relieve a good many missionaries. The preparation of actual texts could be done by a few. Right now this kind of work is scattered and not all has come to a central clearing house so that it can be used. We need a centralization of efforts, so that one agency can know what is going on all over and make everything available to all concerned.

AUDIENCE: The thing that Dr. Nida has said must be the focus of our orientation of missionaries. Linguistics or area studies or whatever must focus on this matter of the communication of the Gospel. As I have thought of what is practical that the Boards can do that would constitute the greatest advances in language proficiency on the part of their missionaries, I come to feel that it is trying to sprinkle some folks like this panel in different parts of the world for maybe a year or so at a time in the hope that the language study that is now just starting in Korea, for example, can be improved and can be built along the lines and insights that this group has. Maybe all we need to do is to say, "Be it resolved that we try to take seriously the recommendation that we passed in 1949."

LANGUAGE APTITUDE AND TESTING PROGRAMS

MAURICE TATSUOKA

*Research Student—Language Aptitude Project
Graduate School of Education, Harvard University*

I should like to start out with some general considerations about what language aptitude is. There seems to be some misconception about language aptitude, or for that matter, about any aptitude. For instance, at the 4th Annual Round Table meeting on Language and Language Teaching held at Georgetown University in 1953, one of the participants recommended that, "We should rid ourselves of the notion that there is an intellectual faculty, a unitary trait-language aptitude." Then he went on emphatically to assert that there is no such thing as language aptitude. Perhaps he was thinking that the use of the term "such and such an aptitude" smacked too much of the old "faculty theory" and such theories as phrenology and so on. The fact that he needed to make such statements seems to reflect that there is a widespread misconception about the nature of aptitude.

The present day psychometricians do not use the term "aptitude" in this sense. They don't assume the existence of any such *entity* as an aptitude. They use it only as a sort of shorthand means of expression, and its usage is defined only in a context dealing with *predicting* how well an individual will acquire a certain language, hence, in identifying and distinguishing between people who will and those who will not learn languages easily.

The modern psychometrician thus sets about searching for traits of ability or of motivations, personality interests, that he can measure and that might help him in making such forecasts of the degree of facility an individual will acquire in a second language. There is no "a priori" guarantee that what he is measuring will indeed fulfill the functions he hopes it will. He is helped by the professional knowledge of the linguists as well as by the insights of practical language teachers. So it turns out to be quite a cooperative venture. The Language Aptitude Project conducted at Harvard under Dr. Carroll's direction is one such example. There was on the staff Dr. Carroll, a psychometrician,

Dr. Sapon, a linguist and teacher of Romance Languages at Ohio State University, and also cooperating was Mr. Earle Richards who has had quite extensive experience in teaching French and Spanish at the high school level. With all these people cooperating, we began with a more or less systematic survey of suitable ability-traits to be studied. We started out with some 30 tests, some of them well-established tests of certain aspects of language ability, others constructed especially for the project. We administered these tests to various groups and attempted a sort of weeding-out process, throwing out tests that didn't seem very helpful, and retaining those that seemed most predictive of future language success.

The general way in which these empirical studies are conducted is to administer tests to groups prior to their studying a language. Then after a period of instruction in a certain language, some suitable criterion as the instructor's grade is obtained, or some standardized achievement test of language is administered to the group. The correlation coefficient is computed between the predictor tests (that is, the tests that were administered prior to the language instruction) and the criterion grades (the instructor-assigned grades, or scores on standardized achievement tests). The magnitude of this correlation coefficient indicates roughly to what extent each of these tests is predictive of success in language learning. Another requisite for having these correlation coefficients computed between each test and the criterion grade is for the construction of a battery of tests.

No single test can do the job adequately. What we want to do is to align a set of tests which, working together as a team, will give as good an indication of language aptitude as possible. For that purpose, it is desirable to have tests that correlate highly with the criterion and correlate lowly among themselves. If you think of it in terms of each test giving a certain amount of information as to the probable success, then when we want to align a group of tests in a team it is quite natural to use those tests that give as non-overlapping information as possible. That is the reason we try to get tests that are correlated highly with the criterion grade (the success of learning after the course) and lowly correlated among themselves. With this general approach, the project went through the weeding-out procedure, starting

with about 30 tests and finally coming down to 5 tests which were made into the ultimate battery known as the *Psi-Lambda Foreign Language Aptitude Battery*.

To give some idea of the degree of success met with, not necessarily by this battery alone, but by the larger number of tests, the validity of the predictive efficiency varied considerably according to the nature of the group and the method of instruction. By the nature of the group, I mean the degree of motivation or interest. By the method of instruction, I mean primarily the intensity of the course—how intense the teaching was. If you have a group that is lowly-motivated, then the interest factor becomes preponderant in determining the degree of success. If the group as a whole is under great pressure and highly motivated to learn, then presumably the determining factor becomes the abilities that are related to successful language learning. It is in this incidental sense that we have studied motivation. Specifically, apart from the tests, the West Point Academy group was given questionnaires which gave indications of whether they thought of themselves as compulsive students. Compulsive students were defined as those who would try their best regardless of their interests. Non-compulsive students are those who would be satisfied with average performance in areas in which they were not interested and would try hard only on those subjects in which they had extreme personal interest. We found indications that the ability tests were more effective in predicting success among those students who were self-rated as compulsive. Also supporting this hypothesis concerning the relation between ability and motivation was the magnitude of correlations found; for instance, in the Air Force trial course, which was itself a screening device. (A short course of four days duration and a concentrated course given jpst for the purpose of screening out those who should be allowed to go on into the actual training program for the full academic year's program.) Obviously, the motivation level was quite high. The correlation between a suitable combination of the tests was .76 in one group, and in another group, an .85 correlation was found.

Another group which yielded a high correlation was the William Penn Charter High School. They also received very intensive language training. Correlations of intermediate value were found

in smaller colleges (liberal arts colleges in Ohio) where also the interest was very high. The average ranged around .56. Relatively low correlations were found in various colleges, again in Ohio, where instruction was not so intensive as in the other colleges first mentioned. Another place where low correlations of .30 and .40 were found was the Air Force Russian group where the group had already been selected by a trial course. Since the group was highly selected, the range of acquisition was not so large. Also, so much had already been invested in getting these people through the trial course, that great effort was made to give individual and special help to the students; this also tended to make the criterion-spread very small. So low correlation was to be expected here.

Empirically, it seems to emerge that the following special types of abilities are important in language learning.

- 1) Verbal knowledge in the native tongue is one ability which seems relevant to the acquiring of a second language.
- 2) The sound-symbol association. This is the ability to associate graphic symbols with the sounds represented by those symbols.
- 3) A memory factor.
- 4) Sensitivity to the grammatical structure of language.

[Mr. Tatsuoka then gave a demonstration of the Psi-Lambda Foreign Language Aptitude Battery, briefly indicating how each of the four special abilities mentioned above was incorporated in the tests. The participants actually took parts of tests, finding some quite interesting and others rather frustrating!]

TOTAL LANGUAGE PROGRAM FOR A MISSION

CHAIRMAN—RICHARD DERIDDER

Member of Board of Missions, Christian Reformed Church

It has been suggested that this topic should cover everything from the first time that a new missionary steps on a foreign shore and begins his initial efforts to the time that a whole seminary is in operation and completely staffed with personnel from the native or indigenous church. Our program up to this time has dealt very largely with problems of language learning and the necessity of having basic skills before beginning such learning. The conference should close on a much broader application of these things.

Dr. Nida will begin and his general subject will be to outline for us the areas in which language is involved and the way in which language is applicable in the broad sense to the total mission program. Mr. Stevick will speak on such things as the reverse language problems and the problems of literacy. Dr. Welmers will give us a resume of an actual program such as that of Dr. Sadler's in Liberia.

NIDA: The problem of the areas in which language operates in the mission field is generally taken for granted. We need to remind ourselves of the degree to which communication is central to our missionary program. Communication is simply the technique by which things become common to them and to us. It is the technique for sharing. It is the technique by which this particular message gets into the hands and hearts and minds of the people. There is communication by life. We communicate by action, by behavior, attitudes, gestures, etc. We have communicated so much of our particular materialistic civilization, our attitudes toward money, our prestige values, by non-verbal forms. But from the standpoint of our Christian message, communication by words stands very central. Not only the historical facts but also the living reality needs to be communicated by symbols which are used to identify these particular fundamental facts. We can break down language and the mission program generally into three categories.

First, the language learning. In language learning we must not restrict ourselves purely to the missionary learning the foreign language in which he is going to communicate. We have misinterpreted the missionary's role if he is going to avoid all previous language learning of Greek and Hebrew, etc. Once I visited a seminary of the Reformed Church in Jakarta. A number of students of that seminary were in our discussions on many theological problems of translation. Those students have to know their own indigenous language, plus Dutch, German, French, English, Greek, and Hebrew, and they also pick up a little Latin in the process. The amazing thing was that those men really had a usable command of those languages. We could converse with most of them to an extent in English. It was simply taken for granted that as background to their total task they needed to acquire those five or six languages as a basis. Our standards for missionaries are far below the standard that those Reformed Church missionaries have set for their seminary students. It is rather pitiful the degree to which nationals in various parts of the world have far greater access to communication in various languages than a high percentage of our missionaries who are going out to instruct them. It is going to be increasingly embarrassing to us in our provincial attitudes.

The missionary needs to know both trade and national languages as well as indigenous tongues. If a man goes to French West Africa, he not only has to deal with officials, in which case he needs to know French, but he should have a ministry to French-speaking nationals. God is no respecter of persons. The attitude that these Frenchmen are outside of the pale of our evangelistic efforts is defeating the cause. Eventually the Africans are going to be incorporated into some larger church entity. That larger church entity is very likely to be oriented toward France and not toward the United States in the future. In France one of the most aggressive, dynamic churches at the present time is the Assemblies of God. They are sending missionaries into West Africa. In fact, they have one of the finest elementary and secondary school programs in Ouagadougou. Some of the leadership is going to come right from that constituency. Though the Africans in French West Africa may detest the French, they do love French culture. We are not going to wean them to our Anglo-Saxon views. That is significant. The missionary must

know the national or trade language. He is also called on to learn the indigenous language.

Part of the problem of the missionary is how to make the best of what in many instances are far from perfect means of language learning. It is relevant to our consideration that the average missionary in a French-speaking area learns an indigenous language better than he does in English-speaking Africa. That means if he is in an English-speaking area, he gets by with speaking English. You will find that in English-speaking areas the missionary will say, "You can't learn these aboriginal languages." But in French-speaking areas right next door, the people do learn those aboriginal languages because they don't speak French well enough to get by. It does not mean that missionaries are generally more stupid who go to English-speaking areas. It just means that there are not the dynamic motivation, drives, or coercion which make this necessary.

The second aspect is language usage. It revolves around two factors, oral use and written use. The oral use is preaching and counselling. Also, there is friendly chatting. The Gospel is communicated better in private conversations with friends in a relaxed atmosphere of conversation than it is ever communicated by preaching, especially on the part of the missionary. For nationals that may not always be the case. This kind of communication must be in the indigenous, government, or colloquial language. We have two major media: the private conversation and the radio and audio-visual programs. For all the good that radio and audio-visual programs do, the personal touch and the personal conversation ultimately mean more for the cause of Jesus Christ.

We are dealing with a whole array of factors when we deal with languages in written form: primers; languages have to be reduced to writing; people have to be taught; grammars of the language; dictionaries. These grammars and dictionaries are not necessarily just for missionaries to learn the languages, but they are also for indigenous peoples to have a more conscious attitude toward their own language and capacity for control, exploiting some of the potentialities of their language which they had not become aware of—an appreciation of their language which they hadn't had previously. In talking with an Indian in Mexico,

a comment was made about his language versus Spanish. He said, "Ah, but we have a language now. We have a dictionary." In other words, he didn't think he had a language until a dictionary was published. The dictionary became to him a symbol that his language now had status and prestige.

There is the need for transition literature. How many times have we realized that people do not go from the primer to the Bible, except by a very difficult and laborious technique which often results in people not learning to read the Scriptures.

Except for the Bible, I am generally opposed to translations. I recommend adaptations. I don't know of any book which wouldn't be improved in many regards by being adapted. The basic idea with local illustrations and local color so that it may communicate locally. In terms of our communication theory, a thing has relevance if it carries meaning in proportion to its particular local value and flavor. Its communication becomes greater in proportion as it is directed specifically to that particular culture. There is one interesting factor about Scriptures. There is no other book which can be translated into so many different languages with a high degree of communicative value as the Bible. The Bible comes from a particular part of the world with a cultural pattern which is more similar to other cultures of the world than any other. It is much easier to translate the Bible into African, Indian, and South Pacific languages than it is to translate anything that has been written by the Western world within the last 500 years. Our culture has become too specialized, our thought molds too closely identified with our own patterns.

After translations we need commentaries. In the Chiluba language of the Congo, there is not only a translation of the Bible, but there are commentaries on almost every book of the Bible. It is one reason why the Chiluba church has produced so many very good preachers. The Bible is not self-explanatory. Tracts, the secular newspapers, magazines aimed at the intellectual approach, the writing of books in the area—these are all important techniques.

Notice the difference between the airplane and the shoe-leather missionary. There is a bit of a symbol in the airplane missionary in the sense that he is constantly concerned about getting there

faster and covering a lot of ground, rather than having the opportunity of walking along, talking with other people, meeting them in their everyday circumstances of life. In communication, we have become airplane-minded. We write books for whole countries. We try to put out publications for the whole missionary world. We try to produce filmstrips which will cover ten countries at a time. We want our publications to be, not in the thousands, but in the hundreds of thousands. We have impersonalized our communication.

This must be corrected in our attitudes toward language. It can only be done as missionaries themselves have a higher concept of the necessity of effective communication on an individual, personal level. We are approaching a period in which we are now going to place greater emphasis upon personal, oral communication. As the missionary has to retreat from his position of administrative responsibility and takes on a position of counselling, guidance, research helper, he is going to have to depend on techniques of infiltration, not techniques of domination. When that is the case, all communication on a personal level acquires a greater value and strategy than it has before.

STEVIK: I am going to reverse for you a list of facts with which you are all very familiar. As Mr. Smalley was talking about language as part of the fabric of life we were thinking of the missionary learning the language and not trying to learn it separately from the life with which it is customarily associated. However, a change in language is a change in the fabric of life.

There are two ways in which the missionary may in some way change the fabric of life by changes which have to do with language. These are the work in literacy education and the problem in what we call "reverse-language." Reverse-language is not talking backwards. We have been talking about the missionary learning the foreign language; now we are going to talk about the missionary teaching his own language or perhaps the government language even though it may not be his native language. These are not the same problems. Techniques and materials which are quite appropriate in helping people learn to read the language which they have spoken all their lives are not identical with the techniques and materials which one needs to

help a person speak, read, and write a language which has been foreign to him for the first twenty or more years of his life.

In literacy education, the most obvious contribution that linguistics makes is in the design of an alphabet. If a missionary goes into a foreign language area without the sort of training we refer to as ability in phonemic analysis, he will hear certain sounds in a language which haven't been written down. They are not relevant. The people themselves do not hear them. On the other hand, the missionary will fail to hear certain distinctions which are very important. The purpose of phonemic analysis for literacy work is to arrive at an alphabet which will parallel (in the number of symbols it uses and the way in which it assigns them) the way in which the people use and respond to their language.

Another thing that the linguist can do which is very important, particularly in designing primer materials and early stage reading materials, is to provide a list of words according to their frequency. Whether it is frequency in the way they are printed in traditional newspapers (which may be in quite a different form of the language than the people speak) or whether this is a matter of frequency in the spoken language or both, this is the type of material the linguist often is called upon to provide.

Finally, we consider the study of transitional probabilities. When a person is beginning to read a new language that he has spoken all his life, he needs to have as easy a time as possible. One way to help him is to present the letter-shapes in as memorable a way as possible. Another way is to be sure that you use words of relatively high-frequency. A third way is to be sure that your sentences and phrases are designed in such a manner that he is able to predict with some accuracy what is going to be next even without any reference to the letter-shapes on the page. There has even been an experimental readability test designed on this basis, where you take a text and cut out every fifth or fourth word and see how easily people can guess the exact word that is cut out. This is another approach to reading ability. These are three things that we can do about literacy; we can give information about phonemic analysis, about frequency of various words or phrases, and transitional probabilities.

In reverse-language the great insight of the last ten to twenty years is to take into account not only the structure of the language that you are teaching but also the structure of the language which is native to your student. This is a very important principle. The linguist is in the best position to find the places where these structures disagree. Probably any two languages in their structures have certain points of similarity. At these points the student who is learning a new language can go ahead and follow his old habits and not get into trouble. But every pair of languages also differ from one another at a few points or many. The linguist can find out where these problems are going to be. He can use these in the design of the materials. A very fine set of materials with which Dr. Welmers was intimately associated are being developed for teaching English in a great number of countries around the world. Linguistic principles can also be used in helping a teacher adapt materials which are already in existence.

Have you heard of the "History of the Steel Ax-Heads and the Stone Age in Australia?" It is the case of the missionary in Australia among the aborigines who was introducing the steel ax. When people know nothing but the stone ax, the steel ax is a great asset. It can simplify life greatly. These missionaries were giving out steel axes to people who were fitting in best with the missionaries' way of doing things. This was giving prestige and economic power to people in the culture, who, from the point of view of the culture itself, often did not deserve it; and this was disruptive. The obvious criticism is that they should have paid attention to the structure of the culture, before introducing these wonderful implements, steel ax-heads. Literacy education is the real steel ax-head. When we introduce these linguistic steel axes, it would be a good idea to find out as much as we can about the culture of the people among whom we are working and what this is likely to mean. This means that we will have to ask some questions of the anthropologists.

Finally, linguistics and anthropology can be of great help in the work we are trying to do. They can be of great help, but they are not and they never can lead to salvation. Even if I go to a country and learn the language so well that I am indistinguishable in the dark from a native, I may be nothing but an inflated ego showing off. Even if I raise the literacy rate from

zero to 100%, I haven't necessarily done anything. Even if I get everybody speaking whatever language they would like to speak fluently and I am the most sought after teacher within a radius of 50 miles, what is this?

WELMERS: The Lutheran Mission in Liberia works primarily with two languages, Kpelle and Loma. I have worked with the Lutheran Mission on the Kpelle language and Dr. Wesley Sadler has concentrated on Loma.

The first thing that Dr. Sadler did was to produce a lesson course for missionaries. The result is a book which he whimsically called, "Untangled Loma." It was the missionaries who were tangled, not the language. This textbook includes sentences, drills in pronunciation, drills in grammar, and it guides one through 21 lessons to a final conclusion. Examinations are prescribed and Dr. Sadler's requirements for missionaries are rather strict. His requirements in the period of language training are just as strict. He requires six hours a day, five days a week, three hours on Saturday. The standards are high, and that is an important thing. The textbook is finished; the language school is in operation. They have set aside a little village for Loma language learning known as the Loma Language Center. It is a village off the beaten track. It is not the mission compound set up on a hill a few hundred yards from the village. There are trained informants who work full time with the missionaries. Six hours a day are spent listening-imitating, listening-imitating.

Sadler then turned his attention to such other problems which he thought were of immediate importance. One of the first publications was a primer. He was already beginning to work on the basis of a translation of the Gospel of Mark. It came out a few years later. But people were not going to read that if they didn't know how to read. So a primer was produced. Then simultaneously with the preparation of the Gospel of Mark, work was done in preparing Bible stories, largely based on Laubach's "Story of Jesus."

Just before I left Liberia I gave one of my informants Catherine Vos's "Child's Story Bible." I have been training him to adapt rather than translate. He hopes to put out such Bible stories in

Kpelle, over a period of months and years, which will give people an easier introduction to the entire Bible message, whereas Bible translating is a slower process.

Sadler began then to develop a series of readers. Some of them were very simple, others more complex and all of them graded. A new one comes out periodically to keep the people interested.

On the front of many of the books is the price, in good sized print. By printing the price on the book, the public is convinced that this is not an object for bargaining.

One thing that came very early in the translation process was the Lutheran Common Service, including the Service for Baptism, Communion, and other Special Services, with some hymns. The reason why the Common Service itself was of considerable importance so early has something to do with an oral tradition. In Kpelle there was an oral tradition of the Lord's Prayer, the Apostles' Creed, and the Ten Commandments. The last part of the Apostles' Creed was completely missing. The Ten Commandments were abbreviated and mixed up in order and the commandments "Thou shall not steal" and "Thou shalt not covet" were completely confused. There was no distinction made between stealing and coveting, because of lack of understanding on the part of interpreters. In the Lord's Prayer people were praying "Do not catch us when we do wrong," instead of "Lead us not into temptation." Some of these things had to be corrected immediately. This is rather advanced literature to be publishing at such an early date, but there was a certain urgency for it.

There is quite an array of literature available to the Loma reader. You may ask how one individual can produce all this and more. One reason is that Dr. Sadler is the author of that classic remark, "The secret of successful language work is applying the seat of the pants to the seat of the chair." The other aspect of the answer is that Dr. Sadler received a great deal of help from his wife. Also, one of the young ladies of the Mission was assigned to the preparation of literature for the literacy work and is now in charge of that aspect of the program. Sadler is working on the Gospel of John at Present and other translations are being prepared. A weekly newspaper which the people read avidly is another development.

Often you hear people say, "We have a primer and we have taught people to read, but there isn't anything for them to read." It is the business of the Missions to produce material for them to read. This is an example that it can be done.

Dr. Sadler and others now are using the language in their mission work more than just for preaching. In personal contacts there is a great deal of it, and they are beginning even on more sophisticated forms of application of language skills. The one ordained man who learned the language and mastered it very well came home on furlough and spent most of his furlough writing a commentary on the Gospel of Mark. It is striking that the Gospel of Mark was published, and before the next portion of Scripture was printed, someone was working on a commentary on the Gospel of Mark.

SUMMARY

EUGENE A. NIDA

Secretary of Translations Department, American Bible Society

First of all, language and life go hand in hand. Language is the principal symbol of group identification. If we are concerned with identification in any sense, we must be concerned with language. Secondly, it is the primary means of interaction within any cultural group. Language stands at a point which is central in our entire thinking about our missionary task. Communication is central to Missions. We are told to "go" and "tell". This lies at the heart of our incarnational faith. It is not an idle word that the Scripture constantly talks about *The Word* and in a sense emphasizes the verbalization, the symbolizing by means of words of certain aspects of reality.

We have been conscious of the inferior performance of missionaries in many situations. We take it for granted that Americans can't learn languages, which is one of our greatest liabilities. Our school programs certainly are not designed to overcome that particular attitude. In general, we do not provide people enough time to learn languages. That is a tragic failure in our mission programs. We are so institutionalized; we have so many administrative things to take care of; the actual amount of paper work that the average missionary has to do in order to send home reports to his constituency is an appalling factor in our ultimate inefficiency on the field. There are not enough pressures to learn languages. There is also not enough emphasis upon spiritual motivation. What do we do about it?

First of all, linguistics must be sold by the linguists, not primarily by the Mission Boards. We must convince people that what we are doing is practical. We are a time-conscious people and if we are going to communicate effectively to our own culture we might as well keep our problem in terms of time. It is the one thing which we hoard most of all. Time is becoming more acute because of the pressures of our alternatives patterns of existence. If we can save people's time, it is significant.

We must create enthusiastic students. Any person who takes a linguistic course and goes out of it lacking enthusiasm is a

black mark for any program of linguistics. The reason for this is that in spite of all our testing and all our background in language aptitude, motivation is one of our fundamental problems. Motivation is reflected in this factor of enthusiasm.

We in the Bible Society are recognizing the fact of the necessity of putting out something on a level that everybody can understand. I wrote the little book "Learning a Foreign Language" some years ago, designed for the people who didn't know anything about linguistics. We found many people who thought it was entirely too difficult. It is a failure from that standpoint. We are putting out another book as a kind of preliminary publication, called "What Makes Language Tick." It will be profusely illustrated with all kinds of silly illustrations. For example, we are going to talk about the word "structure" in terms of ducks and ducklings—prefixes, suffices, suprafices—the little duck jumps on top of the mother duck's back. We hope within a year to get out our "ducky" book on linguistics. We are going to try to communicate some basic ideas about linguistics to people who don't know anything about linguistics.

Secondly, as linguists, we need to understand our limitations. For example, we love to write what are called "analytical grammars" of languages. The trouble with a good analytical grammar is that it is so written that you can read the whole thing and you can't figure out how to say, "I am hungry." Because all the little morphemes, these little parts that go to make up words and the words that go to make up sentences, are described in such a very economical way that you can't, unless you know the whole language, fit the thing together and make any sense of it. In other words, this write-up is very excellent for the man who already knows the language, but when he knows the language he doesn't need the write-ups, unless he is interested in structure. We love structure and it has a certain value to us, provided we recognize that the grammars we write in that way are utterly useless for the average individual. People have called those grammars, "Scientific Grammars," and pedagogical grammars, "Practical Grammars." That is a very foolish distinction because there is just as much science that goes into a pedagogical grammar as goes into a so-called analytical grammar.

Thirdly, we as linguists are going to have to split up our courses and recognize that there are three levels. There is the language learning program which needs to be exceedingly practical on a very practical level. There may be certain individuals who are interested in linguistic analysis who can be interested through this general course in language and communication and language assimilation and will then go on to a course in linguistic analysis. Even in linguistic analysis, a person may learn how to do things without understanding the background of why he does it. He may learn how to work out a practical alphabet along phonemic lines without understanding the theory of the phoneme. There is still a third course for technical linguists to understand the "whys" and "wherefores." The man who is going to help somebody else in his difficult job needs that third step.

The type of teaching that is aimed at in Toronto and at Meadville is the first step. Wycliffe is doing the second step, the training of technicians. They know how to manipulate phonemes even if they don't know the theory of the phoneme. Then the third step is necessary for the man who needs to know why he is doing certain types of manipulation.

The next problem for us as linguists is that we need to gear linguistics more to communication. We must show the missionaries the relationship of the study of structure and their capacity to communicate more effectively. Very frequently we become so involved in the science of structure that we forget these implications. Some of the best interpreters, some of the best communicators in the world don't know one thing about linguistics. Whatever we do, we must attempt to analyze and deal with our structural analysis of a technical nature in terms of the capacity of the individual to communicate in a practical situation. This has led us to undertake another book on the science of translating which will deal with this whole problem, not in terms of the handbook which we now have, called "Bible Translating", but in terms of the basic science of the relationship of linguistics to the problem of communication from one language to another.

What about the Boards? What can be done? The most important thing is the increased motivation which goes right to the heart of the whole problem of motivation to the mission cause. At

outgoing missionary conferences or in conferences where people are being prepared to look forward to their total missionary task, communication and culture should be combined. It is a mistake to teach linguistics in one department and culture in another. Whoever is teaching anthropology certainly wants to orient it toward how a person knowing these cultures can communicate in them. The man who is teaching linguistics has to bear in mind that linguistics is nothing in the abstract; it must be related to cultural contexts. This emphasis can be made on communication and culture at such conferences.

Secondly, it is a mistake to have such weak language exams on the field. No real emphasis is placed upon oral communication ability. Exceptions are constantly being made to the rules and regulations relative to language learning on the field. Here is a place where the Mission Board has to take action.

Another problem is, should you know the indigenous or the trade language? Few missionaries speak the language of the country on the mission stations. In French-speaking areas, if the missionaries were always speaking French, it would remove nine-tenths of the suspicion that government administrators and other people have about these American missionaries. We are so utterly provincial in our concepts, so utterly exclusive, that we fail on some of these very basic points.

Any missionary who is enclosed within the confines of a mission compound and has practically all his contacts with English-speaking people simply isn't going to learn the language. Practically all of his contacts with non-English-speaking people are in situations where he has to talk, not to listen. You can't learn to talk without listening. Missionaries ought to be in circumstances where they have to listen, overhear things—passive reception of the language. Recordings are excellent, but they cannot take the place of listening to people around a campfire.

There is one mission in Latin America in which every missionary has learned an Indian language. Most missionaries in Latin America do not learn an Indian Language. But the Moravians, who have had a mission work for about 100 years in Nicaragua, assume that every missionary is going to learn Miskito. And they do. Nurses, who come down on a two-year basis, talk in

Miskito by the end of their two years. What the Moravians can do in Miskito can be done in any language I know. They do have some good grammars written by some of the early missionaries who did a magnificent job in analyzing the language. Everybody, including wives, learn the language. One of the reasons so many wives break down on the mission field is that they do not have those rewarding social contacts which come from being able to participate in inter-personal relationships with so-called "natives."

Another problem is the examination of missionary candidates. With adequate help from psychologists we ought to be able to get some better concept of a person's communicative interests, desires, and situations. Will they freeze up in a strange situation? Will the inferiority complex which at home makes them talk all the time result in making them shut up all the time abroad? Psychologists ought to be able to give us some help and we ought to be able to guide them into some of the complications which we know but can't explain.

There is not only the problem of language learning from the standpoint of the linguist and the missionary, but we must also take a new view of language in the field. This means helping nationals fully exploit the resources of their own language. In many instances, they are shifting into French and English. This can be very helpful in their total, ecumenical, broader contacts. At the same time, they are sometimes ashamed of their own indigenous tongue. They are unaware of the resources of those indigenous languages. For one reason, the missionaries have learned those languages so poorly. The people have never dreamed that you could talk about important things in the language, because the missionary has always insisted on using French or English to do so. The poor translations—time after time people told me that they have to read the Scriptures in French or English or Spanish or some other language in order to understand what it means in their own native tongue. That is an utter tragedy. It is utterly unnecessary. What can we do about this? What is the future of these languages? Some groups are being assimilated, but the world as a whole is approaching a state of bi-lingualism and tri-lingualism which we are going to have in many countries for at least 100 years. Until women learn the government language, the children are not going to

learn their first language. The indigenous language is going to be the primary language for home and for religious expression.

In Mexico, there is a situation in Tabasco in which the Indians actually teach their children first Spanish because they know they need Spanish in order to go to Spanish schools. But when they get to be about 10 or 11 years of age, they teach them the indigenous tongue, so that they can participate in the social life of the tribe. That type of thing is going to be extended in many areas of the world. Bilingualism is with us and we need to emphasize some of these factors.

Nationalism is growing. Whenever you get a nationalistic movement, you can be sure you will get greater ethnic self-consciousness on the part of individual tribes. Nationalism means greater self-consciousness. With that is greater emphasis on tribal groups at the same time. It is also interesting on a theological scale. We have had a great increase in ecumenicity, but we have never had a period in which individual denominations have been so emphasized. So denominationalism goes right along with ecumenicity because of its greater awareness of our total grouping. Hence, we become more aware of our in-group consciousness on these lower levels.

What about this in the mission field? What are we going to do, The Presbyterians have sent Dr. and Mrs. Raeburn to the Cameroun area. They are faced with a tragic situation where missionaries for years insisted that everybody must learn Bulu in order to be evangelized. Bulu and some of the other languages of the Cameroun are just as different as English, German and Norwegian. But the people had to study the catechism in a language which is just as different from their language as German is from English. These people are now revolting against the use of Bulu. They want their own language and French, not Bulu.

The Presbyterians have sent the Raeburns into that area in order to help a number of very brilliant young speakers of several of these other languages to translate Scriptures and produce some literature in those indigenous languages, as a means of especially reaching the adult population and the women who are never going to be included to the same extent, at least

in the present and next two or three generations, in the French school system.

We might do this type of thing in other areas. Travelling linguistic-communication-evangelists who might go from one place to another, introducing some of these basic concepts in various schools, so that young ministers might realize the effectiveness, the significance of the capacity of communication within their own indigenous stock. In the mission field we have remarkable institutions, outstanding churches, but the one thing that we have practically failed to produce—we have not created theologians. We have not produced men who can interpret these truths in a new context of life and language. They are intellectually dependent upon the West for their patterns of thought. They are not developing their own. This is one of the very subtle, tragic elements of imperialism and there is going to be a reaction against it one of these days. The reaction is going to be much more violent than the reaction against our institutions, because there is nothing so humiliating to a man as to feel that he is intellectually dominated by someone else.

We must re-emphasize the communication of ideas within these languages so that people may more adequately recognize the relationship of the symbols within their own language to their own culture. Perhaps this is an extension of language which we have not considered up to the present time. For example, a great many of our translations now are being done by nationals. No missionaries are on the Committee. We had the Gospels and Acts in the Aymara done by a couple of missionaries and some nationals. It took 15 years to sell about 2,000 copies. We finally chose a committee of three Indians, well-trained in the Canadian Baptist Mission. We spent a few weeks with them, but they were responsible for the job and they knew it. No missionary was dominating them. We published the New Testament. It is only in monoglot so we know it isn't because of the Spanish that they are being sold. Within two years, we have sold more than 3,000 copies. People are so anxious to learn to read that New Testament that they are teaching themselves to read, even without decent primers.

Part of our reaction to language on a basic theological level is our reaction to the over-verbalization of our faith. We became

suspicious of this emphasis on language. That is very valid. But we are now swinging back to a recognition of the fact that we went too far. Language is coming into its context and to its position in a way which we didn't realize it would have. We are going to be placing greater emphasis upon communication in this complex, difficult world.

Discussion

AUDIENCE: In counselling volunteers to the mission field as to their language program here, would you suggest that one language offered in college would be better for them to take than another?

NIDA: Where is the man going to go? If to Latin America, then take Spanish, provided there is some reasonable assurance that he is going to be taught Spanish in such a way that it won't be a liability to him later on. There is not much transfer value from having learned French so that you can pick up Tagalog. A student should learn French; not because that is going to help him learn Tagalog, but because French is going to open a new world to him and help him understand what communication means. If he has one world of communication open, he can then open another world. He must know French well enough so that he enjoys reading French, so that he understands French in terms of its communicative value to him. Then he will adopt a new attitude toward language and he can continue to use the resources published in French even when he is in Japan.

COPLAND: I think you recognized a very fundamental point when you said that most of us never think of learning more than one language. It is that psychological block which we need to get over. When I was twelve I knew French as well as I knew English and when I came to study Chinese, unconsciously the fact that I knew that there was more than one language, there were more than two different kinds of sounds, there was more than one kind of idiom, and so on, made it tremendously easier because I had that bi-lingual background.

NIDA: I hope you will note that it is the basic psychological attitude that is emphasized here and it is not a one-to-one carry-over value that once you have memorized vocabularly in French, you can memorize it more easily in another language. It is this capacity to communicate, this understanding of language as an instrument for communication which is of value.

AUDIENCE: I should like to emphasize something Dr. Nida said, that it is so important that you learn a language in a way which is not a psychological liability to language learning later on. I had German and Spanish in the same institution. If I had had only Spanish, I think I would have been driven off of languages forever. It happened that the German course was taught in such a way that I was given confidence that I could learn it. In counselling a volunteer, it would be well not to assume that all the languages are taught the same way in that institution.

AUDIENCE: For Japan, would it be better for us to send a man to a linguistics and anthropological course here for a year, and then put him out in some remote town in Japan rather than send him for two years to the Tokyo language school?

NIDA: I don't think you can answer that apart from knowing the man. If a person has adaptive capacities to make a good missionary, he might do better in a small town under his own power. But if he is a follower, then you are going to have to provide a course worked out to take care of followers. For example, in Paris it seems to me the course is a waste of time. Some missionaries congregate together and they insist on speaking English. Other pioneer students who have a considerable capacity for self-direction go off in a situation where they can get actual use of the language. It is a problem of individual activity.

AUDIENCE: How are we going to find out the sort of program an individual needs?

NIDA: I wish there were some way in which we could have linguistic advisors working with a number of Boards who could give tests, who could determine some of the individual's background and who could see that such individuals took short-term courses in language learning. On the basis of that background, a linguist also familiar with the language situations abroad and in close collaboration with the people abroad might be able to save us a tremendous amount of time in coordinating efforts, in getting this thing on a more basic scale.

BUTRUS ABDUL-MALIK: How do you account for the fact that many people prefer the English or French translation of the Bible rather than the translation in their own native tongue? My

own daughters prefer to read the English Bible for their devotions rather than the Arabic.

NIDA: In many languages where there is a literary and a colloquial language, the literary language is too high-brow for most people to understand it or enjoy it. The second thing, dealing with an aboriginal language which has no literary tradition, the translation usually has the words correct, but the syntax and the idiomatic expressions are utterly artificial. As one Congolese said of "heap coals of fire on his head,"—"It's a wonderful way of torturing people to death." You "gird up the loins of your mind" by putting a "belt around the hips of your thoughts" and that is all it means. In terms of idiom and syntax, the book is a foreign language.

When it comes to Arabic, there is the literary language plus all those mistakes you are finding in the Arabic Scriptures. For instance, in Hebrew the expression is in the "wind of the day" so that is the way it is in Arabic. When they picked the word for the expression in Genesis "creeping things" the correct Arabic word was used, but now that word refers only to "armored tanks," which isn't exactly the kind of thing we expect to be created in that early period.

But fundamentally, the problems are idiom and syntax. We have been more interested in studying Greek and Hebrew than we have in communicating what we are trying to say. In the war they had this principle: you must translate so everybody can understand. Then they found that wasn't enough. You must also translate so that nobody can misunderstand. That is quite a different principle of translating. Up to the present time, we haven't even had the first principle, when it comes to the Scripture. There is something so holy about this. We have believed that the Word became a book, a Koran, rather than that the Word became flesh and dwelt among us. We have had a wrong concept of the Word.

AUDIENCE: I have noticed the difficulty in the attitude of the missionary learning the language toward the whole matter of structure and the word *grammar*. Is there anything we can do to help them before they go to realize that there is a grammar in

this language that they are going to study and to prepare them for this?

NIDA: In general, there are two types of people. There is the individual who can pick up a language without knowing anything about the structure. That type of person is very blessed. There are other people who learn better because they do learn that there is a structure. I think our position is to tell the individual, "The grammar is something that if you need a little help, there it is. But if you can learn this language without learning any grammar, that is very good." Usually, if you approach a person with this attitude, they will say, "Ah, at last I can learn a language." Then when they get started and ask questions on the way the language works, the answers can be given in terms of explanations, not rules of grammar. Part of the trouble is in the language examinations on the field. They are examinations on grammar, and that is not the important thing. Our ultimate goal is the ability to speak, read and write the language, to be able to communicate.

LIST OF RECOMMENDED BOOKS

Helpful source materials for missionary candidates, missionaries-on-furlough and mission board members. Other more advanced books are listed in the bibliographies included in most of the recommended texts.

I—Language-Learning Helps

BLOOMFIED, LEONARD. *Outline Guide for the Practical Study of a Foreign Language*. Baltimore: Linguistic Society of America, 1942. 16 pp.

CORNELIUS, EDWIN T. JR. *How to Learn a Foreign Language*. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1955. 109 pp.

CUMMINGS, THOMAS F. *How to Learn a Language*. New York: Privately Printed, 1916. Reprinted, 1946. 100 pp. (For further information consult Miss Esther Cummings, Biblical Seminary, New York).

NIDA, EUGENE A. *Learning a Foreign Language: A Handbook for Missionaries*. New York: Foreign Missions Conference of North America, 1950. 237 pp.

WARD, IDA C. *Practical Suggestions for the Learning of an African Language in the Field*. London: Oxford University Press, 1937. 39 pp.

II—Introduction to Linguistics

BLOCH, BERNARD AND TRAGER, GEORGE L. *Outline of Linguistic Analysis*. Baltimore: Linguistic Society of America, 1942. 82 pp.

GLEASON, H. A. JR. *An Introduction to Descriptive Linguistics*. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1955. 389 pp.

HALL, ROBERT A. JR. *Leave Your Language Alone!* Ithaca, New York: Linguistica, 1950. 254 pp.

NIDA, EUGENE A. *Linguistic Interludes*. Glendale, California: Summer Institute of Linguistics, Inc. 1947. 176 pp.

STURTEVANT, EDGAR H. *An Introduction to Linguistic Science*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1947. 173 pp.

III—General Phonetics

- HEFFNER, R.M.S. *General Phonetics*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1949. 253 pp.
- THOMAS, CHARLES KENNETH. *An Introduction to the Phonetics of American English*. New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1947. 181 pp.
- WESTERMANN, D. AND WARD, IDA C. *Practical Phonetics for Students of African Languages*. London: Oxford University Press, 1933. Second Impression 1949. 169 pp.

IV—English as a Second Language

- FRIES, CHARLES C. *Teaching and Learning English as a Foreign Language*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1945. Eleventh Printing, 1954. 153 pp.
- The Structure of English*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1952, 304 pp.
- LLOYD, DONALD J. AND WARFEL, HARRY R. *American English in its Cultural Setting*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1956, 553 pp.
- PRATOR, CLIFFORD H. JR. *Manual of American English Pronunciation for Adult Foreign Students*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1951. Third Printing, 1954. 162 pp.

V—Adult Literacy Education

- GUDSCHINSKY, SARAH. *Handbook of Literacy*. Norman: University of Oklahoma, Summer Institute of Linguistics, 1951. Revised, 1953. 85 pp.
- LAUBACH, FRANK C. *Teaching the World to Read*. New York: Friendship Press, 1947. 246 pp.
- AND LAUBACH, ROBERT S. *How to Make the World Literate Each One Teach One Way*. Syracuse: Privately Printed, 1955. 178 pp.
- URE, RUTH. *The Highway of Print*. New York: Friendship Press, 1946. 277 pp.

VI—Introduction to Anthropology

NIDA, EUGENE A. *Customs and Cultures: Anthropology for Christian Missions*. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1954. 306 pp.

God's Word In Man's Language. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1952. 191 pp.

Bible Translating. New York: American Bible Society, 1947. 362 pp.

CONFERENCE PARTICIPANTS

ALBRIGHT, LELAND S.

Director, The Canadian School of Missions.

BAILEY, MRS. MOSES

Member, American Friends Board of Missions, The Five Years Meeting of Friends.

BLACK, MILDRED

Missionary under the Board of Missions of the Methodist Church. Ph.D. Applicant, Hartford Seminary Foundation.

BLOOMQUIST, NORMA

Visiting Lecturer in Literacy Education, Kennedy School of Missions.

BORTON, ELIZABETH (MRS. HUGH)—Japan Committee of the Religious Society of Friends in Philadelphia.

BUTRUS, ABDUL MALIK

The American University at Cairo; Department of Muslim Lands, Kennedy School of Missions.

CHARLTON, GORDON T.

Assistant Secretary, The Overseas Department of the Protestant Episcopal Church.

COPLAND, E. BRUCE

Associate Secretary, Missionary Personnel Division of the NCCCUA.

DERIDDER, RICHARD R.

Member of the Board of Missions of the Christian Reformed Church. M.A. Candidate, Kennedy School of Missions.

DICK, E. D.

President, Seventh-Day Adventist Theological Seminary.

DIXON, CANON, L.A.

General Secretary, Missionary Society of the Church of England in Canada.

DOUWSMA, GERRIT B.

Secretary of the International Visitation Fellowship of the Young Men's Christian Associations.

DUNN, N. W.

Associate Secretary of the General Conference of the Seventh-Day Adventists.

ELSON, BENJAMIN

Instructor, Summer Institute of Linguistics; Ph.D. Candidate, Cornell University.

FENN, HENRY C.

Director, The Institute of Far Eastern Languages, Yale University.

GALBRAITH, JOHN P.

General Secretary, The Committee on Foreign Missions of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church.

GAMMACH, ELLEN B.

Personnel Secretary, The Woman's Auxiliary of the National Council, Protestant Episcopal Church.

GLEASON, HENRY A., JR.

Associate Professor Linguistics, Kennedy School of Missions.

GRABER, JOSEPH DANIEL

Secretary, Mennonite Board of Missions and Charities. Attending the Kennedy School of Missions.

GRICE, E. E.

Candidate Secretary, Board of Foreign Missions of the United Presbyterian Church of North America.

HOHLFELD, J. MAURICE

Acting-Dean and Professor Linguistics of the Kennedy School of Missions.

HODGE, CARLETON T.

Head of Department of Near Eastern and African Languages, Foreign Service Institute, Department of State.

KEYES, EMILY

Missionary, The American Baptist Foreign Missionary Society; student, Kennedy School of Missions.

KIRBY, CLARENCE

Executive Secretary, American Advent Mission Society.

LOEHLIN, CLINTON

Missionary under the Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church. Ph.D. Candidate, Hartford Seminary Foundation.

McKAUGHAN, HOWARD

Acting Director, North Dakota Branch, Summer Institute of Linguistics; Ph.D. Candidate, Cornell University.

NIDA, EUGENE

Secretary, American Bible Society.

ORJALA, PAUL

Missionary under the General Board of the Church of the Nazarene; M.A. Candidate, Kennedy School of Missions.

PARKINSON, W. W.

Candidate Secretary, American Baptist Foreign Mission Society.

REX, FRED

Educational Secretary, Committee on World Literacy and Christian Literature, NCCCCUSA.

ROBINSON, SUE

Missionary under the Board of Missions of the Methodist Church. Student, Kennedy School of Missions.

SHACKLOCK, FLOYD

Executive Secretary, Committee on World Literacy and Christian Literature, NCCCCUSA.

SHEPARD, FLOLA

Associate Professor of Linguistics, Kennedy School of Missions.

SMALLEY, WILLIAM A.

Associate Secretary, American Bible Society.

SPRIGG, JAMES L.

Administrative Secretary, American Baptist Foreign Mission Society.

STEVICK, EARL

Professor of Linguistics, Scarritt College.

TATSUOKA, MAURICE

Graduate Student, Language Aptitude Project, Graduate School of Education, Harvard University.

WALZER, WILLIAM C.

Associate General Director, Joint Commission on Missionary Education, NCCCUSA. Visiting Lecturer in Journalism, Kennedy School of Missions.

WELMERS, WILLIAM E.

Associate Professor of Linguistics, Kennedy School of Missions.

WILLIAMS, M. O.

Candidate Secretary, Board of Missions of the Methodist Church.

CRAGG, A. KENNETH

Professor of Arabic and Islamics, Kennedy School of Missions.

LESER, PAUL W.

Professor of Anthropology, Kennedy School of Missions.

PAUL, IRVEN

Associate Professor of Latin American Studies, Kennedy School of Missions.

PITT, MALCOLM

Professor of Indian Studies, Kennedy School of Missions.

STENSTROM, OSCAR

Visiting Professor of African Studies, Kennedy School of Missions.

CONFERENCE COMMITTEE

RUSSELL H. STAFFORD—*President*

J. MAURICE HOHLFELD—*Acting Dean*

NORMA BLOOMQUIST

E. BRUCE COPLAND

H. A. GLEASON, JR.

FLOLA SHEPARD

WM. E. WELMERS

STELLA LANE—*Dean of Women*

GENERAL INFORMATION

COMMUNITY SERVICE

The Greater Hartford Community and the communities of the Connecticut Valley afford many opportunities for service not only by missionaries on furlough but by missionary candidates as well. The inspiration and information concerning the missionary movement is taken into scores of churches each year. Other avenues of service include the teaching of English to doctors from other lands, a literacy program for Puerto Rican residents and inter-racial activities in an integrated church in the city. Several church groups come to the campus yearly to see the School of Missions and to learn of the current situation in mission areas. Many students serve in churches of their denomination.

NURSERY EDUCATION

The nursery school for children between the ages of 2 and 4 years is conducted under the auspices of the School of Religious Education. Parents and children are a part of this education and mission families have been very grateful for the new understanding and relationships that have developed through this training. Mothers of mission families have been student teachers in this laboratory school, fitting them for overseas service of this nature.

HOUSING

Facilities for accommodating single men and women and couples have been for the most part adequate up to the present time. Eighteen apartments for student families are filled each year, with the other families being housed in the community. One denomination that is interested in housing for its families is building a duplex upon the Campus. Other churches are invited to consider this same arrangement for their students.

EXPENSES

The total cost for one year of study for a single person including tuition, fees, board and room are about \$760. The cost for a couple, if husband and wife are enrolled, would be double that for a single student. The cost for families varies somewhat depending upon the size of the apartment. The tuition and room rent including utilities for the school year average about \$1250 for each family.